BAP
S5314

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. .....

SS
10332

Truth Prevailing

Against the

Fierceſt Oppoſition.

BEING A

VINDICATION

OF

Dr. *RUSSEL*'s True Narrative of the *Portſmouth* Diſputation.

Wherein thoſe unjuſt Reflections caſt upon divers Miniſters, and others of the *Baptiſt* Perſwaſion, in that Partial Account publiſhed by the *Presbyterians*, are diſproved, and their falſe Accuſations detected and refuted.

Alſo, a Sermon upon *Mat.* 28. 19. by Mr. *John Williams*, late Miniſter of the Goſpel; with his Letter to Mr. *Leigh* concerning the Diſpute.

As alſo an Anſwer to the *Presbyterian* Dialogue, by another Hand.

Publiſhed by Mr. *JOHN SHARP*, Miniſter of the Goſpel, and Paſtor of the Church of Chriſt at *Froome* in *Somerſetſhire*; who was Moderator at the Diſputation in *Portſmouth*.

London, Printed, and ſold by *M. Fabian* at *Mercers-Chappel* in *Cheapſide*. 1700.

THE Epistle to the Reader.

WE were engaged about a year since in a publick Disputation at Portsmouth upon these two Questions, viz. 1. Whether, according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Adult Believers are only the proper Subjects of Baptism, and not Infants? 2. Whether the Ordinance of Baptism, as appointed by Christ, is to be administred by dipping, plunging (or) overwhelming only, and not otherways?

The occasion of that Disputation appears from the Preliminaries signed on their part, by Mr. Samuel Chandler, and Mr. Francis Williams, two Presbyterian Ministers, in the following words, Whereas by Mr. Chandler's late preaching on the Ordinance of Baptism, several Persons have taken offence; and upon desire of satisfaction, it's mutually agreed between us, whose Names are under-written, That these two Points be amicably disputed, &c. So that Mr. Chandler's Sermons were the cause of the Offence, and their desire of Satisfaction the occasion of the Disputation: And as for Dr. Russel, he knew not of that Agreement till afterwards, so that he could not possibly be the Aggressor.

When the Dispute was over, the Doctor having extraordinary occasion (by reason of his Wife's Illness, and other pressing Affairs) return'd for London the next morning; but before he could reach home, an Advertisement was printed in the Post-man (supposed to be pro-

cured by their importunity) giving an unfair and biassed Account thereof to the World. And some time after they published another Advertisement in the Flying-Post, *full of Untruths, as I have formerly told them. And this, together with the Noise and Clamour they made in the time of the Dispute, by which the People were hindred from hearing what was spoken, were the Reasons why it was thought meet to make it publick; of which they had a particular account in the Dedication: And whatever be the Consequence, they must not throw it upon us, but take it to themselves.*

As touching our Narrative, we think it may deserve the Title of a True Narrative; for it was published with all faithfulness, as to what was there delivered, according to the best account we could get either from our own Memories, or the Copies we could procure: And if they had been minded to have inform'd us of any thing further, they should not have refused us a sight of their Copy when desir'd. But after all this noise of Omissions and Alterations, &c. if they can say no more, nor give any better Demonstration of what they have said than what doth yet appear, we must needs tell them that our Narrative will stand good, notwithstanding all their Clamor against it; and theirs will appear to be (not an impartial, but) a partial Account. And this we may further assure them, that as they have manag'd it, they have been so far from giving us any further light or satisfaction therein, that they have wholly frustrated the great Expectation of divers of their Friends: For, when they saw those Advertisements they published from time to time complaining against our Narrative, and that Certificate they sent into the West, wherein they boast of their great Victory over us, which they saw was stuff'd with such great swelling words of Vanity, at the same time charging our Narrative to be full of palpable notorious Falshoods; and desiring them to suspend their

Judg-

Judgments till they had a view of their Answer: It made their own People to abuse us, and reflect upon us by their over Credulity; and filled them with an Expectation of some great things to be discovered when theirs should come out into the World. But at last (after six months time) when it came to their view, they found their Expectations frustrated: For, instead of giving them a more clear account, they had so torn and mangled it, that it seems to them to be in a most mishapen form, scarcely intelligible: And not so much as one of those vast numbers they boasted of could be procured to testify to the truth of what they had certified under their hands. This made divers Presbyterians to own the Truth, and submit to holy Baptism upon Profession of Faith, as several had done upon the Disputation: For when they saw there was Railing instead of Reason, and pretended Probabilities in the room of solid Arguments; and a false Abstract of Mr. Chandler's *old patch'd up Sermons, taken out of other Mens Works, instead of those new Arguments they were in expectation of; and not one single Scripture Testimony either where it was commanded, or any Example of any one Infant that was baptized, either by* John *the Baptist, Christ or his Apostles, or any other Primitive Minister whatsoever; it was sufficient to convince any considerate judicious Persons, that they had been hitherto misled by these blind Guides, and that they had no design (let their pretences be what they will) that this Gospel-Ordinance should be restored to its Primitive Purity, and first Institution, according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which they know to be agreeable to our Practice, and have confest it so to be. For,*

Mr. Chandler *in the Sermon he preach'd* Nov. 24. 1698. *on* 1 Cor. 12. 13. *saith thus.* I come to the fifth thing proposed, to show the Subjects of Baptism, who are qualified for the receiving of this Ordinance.

Here we are to consider, either who are qualified in the sight of God, or who in the sight of the Church: That is, to whom God will apply the inward Grace signified in this Ordinance, and who Men may admit to Baptism, as not being able to judg of the Heart.

First therefore in the sight of God, Repenting Believers are to be baptized, they have an undoubted right to this Ordinance. God hath been graciously pleased to order it, that all those that turn to him by Faith in Christ, with resolution of Subjection and Obedience to him, should be admitted to this Ordinance, wherein he signifies and seals he will give them remission of Sin, adopt them into his Family, and give them Right and Title to Heaven. These were the Subjects of Baptism when the Ordinance was first instituted and appointed. Then it was necessary Men should repent and believe, otherwise they had no right to this Ordinance. While Men remained in a state of Judaism or Heathenism, till they give up themselves to Christ, submit to the Lord Jesus, they had no right to this Ordinance: Therefore you read, *Repent and be baptized*; and, *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst.* So that if we were sent into an Heathen Nation, we ought to engage them to repent and believe before we administer this Ordinance to them.

2. In respect of the Church, profest Believers are to be baptized. God, he doth not give the inward use of this Ordinance to any but those that actually repent and believe: But the Church cannot see the Heart: Where Men therefore make a solemn Profession of Faith and Repentance, there they are to be admitted to this Ordinance. Where Men have a competent understanding of the Principles of Christian Religion, and solemnly profess to devote themselves to the Lord Jesus

Jesus Christ, and contradict not this Profession by notorious Ungodliness, or an openly wicked Life, these we ought to admit.

Would not any Man that had been a Stranger, and heard Mr. Chandler *preach such Doctrine, have taken him for a Baptist Preacher, and not a Presbyterian? But pray how doth he acquit himself from being αὐτοκατάκριτος, condemned in himself? His Answer is this, If any through mistake, or neglect of the Parents, have not been baptized, they ought to submit to this Ordinance, as thereby professing they give up themselves to God. The same with what he said at* Portsmouth *in our very entrance upon the Dispute,* viz. *he did own that Adult Believers were the proper Subjects of Baptism. Dr.* Russel *said, Then you own our Practice to be right. Mr.* Chandler *said, Yes, if they have not been baptized in their Infancy. Dr.* Russel *replied, You suppose they are to be baptized by virtue of some Commission, and that it is by the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Mr.* Chandler *answer'd, Yes, I do so.*

By all this it appears these Presbyterians own that Christ hath commanded Adult Believers to be baptized, and they are the proper Subjects intended in our Lord's Commission: So that at best, if Infants are the Subjects of Baptism, they are but improperly so. But (by his Confession) if Infants are not at all intended in that Commission, then those that we baptize upon Profession of Faith are the only proper Subjects of Baptism (according to Christ's Commission) and Infants are not the Subjects at all. And till he answers like a Logician to Dr. Russel's *first Argument, and produces his Instance upon his universal Negative, and shews us where it is written, that Christ hath required any of his Ministers to baptize any one Infant, the Controversy is fairly issued, and it's we, and not they that have obtained the Victory; or*

rather, that Truth is ſtrongeſt, and hath prevailed.

Theſe Men are juſt like the Phariſees, &c. in our Saviour's time, who acknowledg'd that the fifth Commandment did oblige the Iſraelites *to honour and relieve their Parents in their Neceſſities: But by an Invention of their own, by putting a falſe Gloſs upon the words, as appears by their* Talmud *(treating of Vows)* Chap. 10. *a Man is bound to honour his Father and Mother, except he vow the contrary. This our Lord takes notice of in* Mat. 15. 4, 5, 6. Mark 7. 10, 11, 12, 13. *by the name of* Corban, *a Gift. In* Pool's *Annotations you have theſe words: As touching this word* Corban, *the moſt free and unconſtrained ſenſe ſeemeth to be this: The Phariſees were a very covetous Generation, and had a ſhare in the Gifts that were brought unto God for the uſe of the Temple, or otherwiſe; thence they were very zealous and diligent in perſwading the People to make ſuch Oblations: And when any pretended the need that their Parents ſtood in of their help, they told them, that if they told their Parents it was a Gift* (i. e.) *that they had vow'd ſuch a portion of their Eſtate to a ſacred uſe, that would before God excuſe them for not relieving their Parents, &c. and that they were not obliged by that Precept to honour and relieve them any longer. Thus he tells them that by their Traditions, under pretence of a more religious expounding the Divine Law, they had indeed deſtroy'd it, and made it of no effect at all.*

In like manner, if you ask theſe Presbyters, Whether Jeſus Chriſt gave Commiſſion to his Miniſters to baptize Believers? Mr. Leigh *ſhall ſpeak for them; his words are theſe,* We muſt all confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt gave Commiſſion to baptize Believers when at the Age of Maturity.

But if this Queſtion were put to the Phariſees, Whether ſuch Jews *were obliged by that Command of God*

to

to honour and relieve their Parents, who had said to their Father or to their Mother, Corban? *Their Answer was, He is free, and they suffered him no more to do ought for his Father or his Mother.*

In like manner, if you ask these Presbyters, whether such Persons are obliged by that Command of Christ to be baptized in his Name when they come to years of Maturity and do believe, who have been baptized in their Infancy? Their Answer is (as the Pharisees of old) they are freed from that Obligation, and they will not suffer them to be rightly baptized according to Christ's Commission: Whereas Mr. Chandler *confesses they ought so to be, if they had not been baptized in their Infancy.*

Now forasmuch as there is no other Authority for Infant-sprinkling, but what the Pharisees had for their Corban, *i. e. the Command or Tradition of Men, why may not we apply the words of our Saviour (to the Pharisees) unto these Presbyters? Thus have ye made the Commandment of Christ for holy Baptism of none effect by your Tradition of Infant-sprinkling; and thereby render'd the Word of God of none effect: And that it's vain Worship that is taught by the Precepts of Men, you must be forced to acknowledg, or deny the words of our Saviour: And if Will-worship, vain Worship, Mens Commandments, and Human Traditions be not forbidden in the Word of God, there is nothing forbidden; but Men are then at liberty to do what they please in the Worship of God. Why you (that are of this Opinion) should keep up a Separation from the Church of* England, *unless it be for Humour and Interest, I cannot imagine. But to proceed.*

These learned Annotators say, That altho the Jews *did for some tract of time keep to the Divine Law, yet in process of time they abused that Text,* Deut. 4. 14. *to found a new Invention upon it: That besides the Law written in the five Books of* Moses, *God delivered to him*

him in the Mount divers things which were not written, which he delivered only by word of mouth to the Sanhedrim, *which are to them as much a Rule of Judgment as any part of the Law which was written: By which means they gained themselves a liberty of making the Law of God what they pleased.*

From whence we also may observe, that they did not deny this to be written that is recorded in the fifth Commandment, but that the other was also intended and included in it, which they endeavoured to perswade the People to believe, by their false Glosses upon the Text: For they confess it was not expresly written in the Law, but that it might be intended, tho not expreſt: And that it was delivered by word of mouth, tho it be no where so written in all the Word of God: For they call'd it a Tradition of the Elders.

Whether Covetousness (as in the Pharisees) lies at the root of this Practice of Infant-sprinkling, themselves are the best Judges: But this they confess, That it is not expresly commanded in the Word of God: But they endeavour to perswade the People that it is intended therein (altho they can't produce one Instance of any Infant that was baptized) and by their corrupt Exposition of some Passages in holy Scripture, and their false Glosses (like those of the Pharisees) they prevail upon their ignorant and unthinking admirers to believe it upon their word, altho there is not one syllable of it recorded in the holy Scriptures.

But when this will not do, they tell them it was the Practice of the Church for many Ages, and they have reason to believe that it was taught by the Apostles, altho there be no mention of it in holy Scripture. For in p. 13. *of their own Account they say, that* Paul *might declare it, tho the New Testament should not discover that he did. And in* p. 15. Paul *might have declar'd the Baptism of Infants an hundred times over, and yet it might*

might not be left on Record in his Epistle to the Ephesians, *nor any part of the New Testament that he did so. I therefore demand of these Presbyters, that if they be not of the Papists Opinion, that Infant-Baptism is an unwritten Tradition, what moved them to use their very Language? Had they not a fit opportunity to produce a Scripture-instance if they had been able? But it seems all the skill they have, with all their pretences to Learning, is not sufficient to inable them to find it out; and therefore we must still charge it upon them as a Scripture-less Practice, and a mere Human Invention, without the least shew of either Precept or Example to be found for it in all the Word of God: And consequently we must reject it as an unwritten Tradition, and Will-worship; and (as such) forbidden by the holy Scriptures; and that from the Pens of the most learned Pedo-Baptists, in their Expositions of the second Commandment.*

And seeing these Men grant this Practice of theirs is not expresst in the Writings of the New Testament, let them tell us the reason of this total silence therein? Why did not our Lord command it if he intended it should be practised? Why did not the Apostles set it down in their Writings? What can be the reason why those holy Men should not make some mention of it in the many Books they have purposely written for our Instruction? Why did the four Evangelists conceal it? The Acts *of the Apostles make no mention of it when they set down in writing so many thousands of Men and Women that were baptized? How comes it to pass that the Apostles* Peter, James, John *and* Jude, *who wrote such excellent Epistles, should not say one word about it? But above all, the Apostle* Paul, *who wrote fourteen admirable Epistles, and speaks in them so often of this holy Ordinance of Baptism, who professes he did declare all the Counsel of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable to be known, and praises them for keeping the Ordinances as they were de-*

livered

livered to them, and declares, that as he received them of the Lord, so he had delivered them; does not in all his Epistles make the least mention of Infant-Baptism. Is not this alone a great Argument against your Practice? I pray consider it: For the Apostle saith, Let every Man prove his own Work. *You assert it, and therefore it lies upon you to prove it.*

But to evade this, you make use of the same method against us, as the Papists do against the Protestants, when they demand of them to give some formal Passage in Scripture that doth expresly and by name deny what they affirm, viz. *where it's said expresly that there is no fire of Purgatory, and that the Pope of* Rome *is not the Head of the universal Church, and that the Mass is not a Propitiatory Sacrifice. Now this method of Disputation is accounted in the Papists an unjust caviling to demand such unreasonable Proof, or else to pretend the Protestants cannot answer them. The* Turks *may as reasonably demand of the Papists, where there is to be found any formal Passage in Scripture that saith expresly that* Mahomet *is not a true Prophet,* &c. *and then pretend the Papists cannot answer them. And surely if it be unjust caviling in their own esteem, when demanded of them, it must be the same in themselves when they demand it from the Protestants.*

Just so you Presbyters serve us. It belongs to you that impose this Opinion of yours upon us, and oblige others to believe it, to make the truth of it appear from holy Scripture. For no one is bound to believe that which cannot be prov'd to be true. You say that the Infants of believing Parents ought to be baptized; but we deny it. It's not our business to prove our denial by shewing some formal Passage in Scripture where it's said in terminis *that Infants are not to be baptized; it's enough for us to tell you that there is neither Command nor Example for it in all the holy Scripture: And till you give your Instance*

ſtance where it is ſo written, we ſhall neither believe nor practiſe it: For till that be done, the Controverſy betwixt you and us is at an end: And (in my opinion) you had better have forbore ingaging in it at firſt, ſeeing you have ſo little skill to manage it. There was one preſent at the Diſpute who wrote thus to his Friend in London, *Sir,* We have ſeen the groſs Abuſes of the Diſpute printed by Mr. *Chandler*, &c. who makes Lies his Refuge, *&c.* to favour his bad Cauſe. *But as a Miniſter of the Church of* England *ſaid, If* Chandler *and the reſt had no better Proof for their Separation from the Church, or Arguments to defend it, they were grand Schiſmaticks; for they proved nothing. Another Miniſter of the Church of* England *that was alſo at the Diſpute, told a friend of mine, that he had ſeen our printed Narrative, and did declare that it was a very good Account of the Diſputation. Alſo a Doctor of Divinity, who came to give me a Viſit, told me that a Country Parſon of his Acquaintance who heard the Diſpute, did declare to him his great Diſſatisfaction againſt the* Presbyters *both for their weak and ill management of themſelves in that Diſpute; and did alſo declare to him that the* Baptiſts *were too hard for them. And this was no mean Man among the Clergy that gave him this account. I thought meet to put this in print, to put a ſtop to their vain-boaſting.*

As touching their Account of the Diſpute, if it had been ſutable to their Title, the World had heard nothing further from us about it; for we deſire no other but that it may be truly known what paſt therein on both ſides: And if they had not given ſuch ſevere and uncharitable Reflections upon divers Perſons of our Perſwaſion, both Miniſters and others, upon the dead as well as the living, and ſo forc'd us to write in our juſt defence, they had not received any harſh Language from us; for we do not think that an advantage to any Cauſe: but what we have done of that kind, we may ſay with the Apoſtle, they have

compell'd

compell'd us to do: For we have not used this method out of any prejudice against their Persons, but to defend our selves from their unjust Reflections, and to vindicate that Truth they oppose, and which we believe in our Consciences to be the Mind of God, in opposition to that human Invention practised by them.

We have also took care to publish the Testimonials sent to us by particular Persons, according to their direction; leaving out some things we thought might too much expose Mr. Chandler *and Mr.* Robinson; *for which I am sure we deserve their thanks. If what is contain'd therein be not delivered with that Accuracy as some may expect, let them consider it's not every Man's Talent so to do; neither do matters of Fact always require it.*

Whereas we have caused to be printed an Answer to their Dialogue, written by a Friend to that Truth we profess, who lives in the Country, and gave it to Mr. Sharp *when he came to* London, *with liberty to print it, if he saw good: And altho (for some prudent reasons) his Name is not thereunto affixed, he will not be wanting to vindicate what he hath written, when a just occasion shall present.*

The Reasons for its brevity are these. 1. *Because he himself had but little time to prepare for it.* 2. *The reason why I made no inlargement, was because I never saw their Dialogue till after Mr.* Sharp *shew'd me the Answer to it.* 3. *Our time together was very short, and we did not think fit to alter another Man's Copy.* 4. *Mr.* Sharp *being Moderator, he did not think it so fit for him to engage in it; and if the Author had not been refer'd to, they should have had no Answer from him. As for Mr.* Sharp, *he desired me to make an Apology for him with respect to his brevity,* &c. *But as I know not of any need there is for me to do it, so my limits in this Epistle will not permit me to inlarge.*

As for that new-fashioned way of burying with a Turf only on the Head, which those Dialogue-makers seem to

be

be so pleased with, as I know not any that practise it, so I shall leave it to themselves as I found it, without any Remarks upon it; not supposing the Reader will be fond of the Invention. But any whimsical Conceit serves these Presbyters *to employ their Wits upon in ridiculing our Practice of the holy Ordinance of Baptism, as commanded and submitted unto by the Son of God. If it be so grievous in their Eyes, why do they not answer what their own learned Authors have said for our manner of Baptism, before they thus reflect upon it? For, as one of their own Ministers hath told the World in print (since the* Portsmouth *Disputation) that their excusing themselves from that manner of Administration we use (by dipping the Person under Water) because of the coldness of the Climate, is in his opinion but a cold Plea. And notwithstanding their outcry against us, themselves could practise it upon Mr.* Fox, *to serve a turn.*

There are so many Errors in their Account, that I shall not trouble my self any further about them, for my leisure will not permit me: and there's so much said in the Book it self to prove theirs to be what it is, i. e. *a false and scandalous Account, that I need not add any more.*

As for Mr. John Williams's *Sermon upon the Commission, we were not willing the World should be deprived of it, not only because he hath deserved well of the Publick, but because they are the words of a dying Man; and we hope the Reader will not see cause to repent of that additional Charge he is thereby put to in the Price of the Book; for we are perswaded it will more than compensate that small Charge.*

I shall conclude with what I did before (notwithstanding their perverse Construction of it) that the great Jehovah, *from whom we receive all Blessings, would make our Endeavours herein successful to his Glory and the good of Souls, that so there may be added to the Church daily such as shall be saved.*

WILLIAM RUSSEL.

Directions for the more ready finding out the particular matters treated of in this Book.

MR. *Sharp*'s Animadverſions begin *Page* 17.
Mr. *Bowes*'s Letter, *p.* 45.
Another Teſtimony from the principal Brethren of the Church againſt Mr. *Chandler*, to prove him a falſe Accuſer, *p.* 49.
Mr. *Leddel* of *Goſport*'s Vindication, *p.* 50.
An account of thoſe Falſhoods they charge on Dr. *Ruſſel*, *p.* 56.
Dr. *Ruſſel*'s Obſervations upon their Dedication, *p.* 65.
His Obſervations upon their Account of the Diſpute, *p.* 71.
Truth vindicated, or an Anſwer to their Dialogue, *p.* 93.
Dr. *Ruſſel*'s Animadverſions upon their Epiſtle, *p.* 94.
A Sermon preach'd by Mr. *John Williams* from the Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28. 19. To which is prefix'd his Letter to Mr. *Leigh*, after the Diſpute, *p.* 128.
Mr. *Iſaac Marlow*'s Letter to Dr. *Ruſſel*, about the Etymology and uſe of the *Dutch* word *Doop*, &c. *p.* 178.
Mr. *Iſaac Harman*'s Poſtſcript, to prove the notorious Falſhoods and Lies contain'd in Mr. *Chandler*'s Poſtſcript to their ſecond Edition, *p.* 181.

ERRATA.

PAge 28. line 17. for *wherei nour*, read, *wherein our*. P. 34. l. 25. f. *you*, r. *them*. P. 90. near the bottom, for *underſtand*, r. *underſtands*. P. 161. l. 34. f. *alter*, r. *Altar*. And if there be any others that have eſcaped our notice, the Reader is deſired to correct them.

Here begins the ANIMADVERSIONS *of Mr.* John Sharp, *Minister of the Gospel, and Pastor of the Church of Christ at* Froome *in* Somersetshire, *who was Moderator at the Disputation in* Portsmouth.

IT may be thought strange that I should appear in this nature to the World, in the matter relating to our Opposers Disputation and Controversy with Dr. *Russel*; it is not as tho the said *Doctor* had any need of my Assistance (and therefore I intend no long Apology) but only for these *Reasons* following.

1. *Because it is the Cause of God, wherein his Truth is eminently concerned.*

2. *Because our Opposers have condemned our Narrative in that which they allow in themselves in their own Narrative.*

3. *Because Brother* Williams *is dead, who was able to have vindicated what he then offered (tho he is now brought in as one then rambling in his Discourse.* See their *Narrat.* p. 59.)

4. *Because it is fit that the World should be informed how unfairly they dealt by us, both at the Dispute, and now since, in their Narrative.*

In these my short Notes I shall not strictly tie my self to this or that particular method, but shall begin first to take notice of their declaring publickly, in the Appendix to their Narrative, *p.* 64. that we made the first Disturbance; whereas all that were present may remember how they acted towards us, making the first Disturbance themselves: And therefore I do assure

all, where-ever the Narrative may come, that it was not as they relate it; and I am ready to think they themſelves might forget it, by having ſo much buſineſs upon their hands, or elſe it muſt be to make thoſe that are at a diſtance believe how well they carried it towards us, tho I was forc'd to reprove the People and them too, which I ſhould not have done had they not acted towards us in that *manner* as they did. I am ready to give my Teſtimony before a Magiſtrate, if required, that they themſelves did make the firſt Diſturbance. How this might be improv'd againſt them, I will leave themſelves and others to judg, if it were managed by their own Pens. Let them but remember their Deportment towards Mr. *Williams* when he quoted *Eraſmus*, and ſeriouſly reflect upon it. Alſo I would not have Mr. *Leigh* forget, when he was charged afterwards with hiſſing, and he denied it, ſaying, he did not hiſs: Mr. *Williams* being preſent, ſaid to him, *Sir, You did hiſs*; he the ſaid Mr. *Leigh* anſwer'd and ſaid, *It might be an Interjection*, making as if it was but a ſmall thing. And tho Mr. *Williams* is dead, there are thoſe that were preſent that can give evidence of this; and I my ſelf can give it more fully, as I received it from Mr. *John Williams*, if there ſhall be need. But I would beg of you, Mr. *Leigh*, if you come to read this, that you would not be in an heat, as you were then; for, if you are, much Water will not quench it, if I may ſay by you as you ſaid (*Nar.* p. 60.) by Mr. *Leddel*, you being, as I ſuppoſe, concerned in drawing up your Narrative. But muſt this be your way of ridiculing the Ordinance of Chriſt (as by us pleaded for?) I did think we ſhould have been better treated at your hands. I mention not this out of any diſreſpect to you, but that you may be ſenſible that it is true what is ſaid before, and that you were in the miſtake.

Our

Our Oppoſers may alſo remember how ready Mr. *Robinſon* was at all times to make Diſturbance, ſaying to Dr. *Ruſſel*, *If you know not how to form your Argument, I will tell you:* which the *Doctor* had no need of, for he offered more than they did know how by any fair and due method to evade, or than ever they will be able to anſwer. I never perceived that he was at a loſs at any time to form his Argument, or to give them an Anſwer. But Mr. *Robinſon* was ſo often in this abuſive work, that Mr. *Biſſel* ſaid, *Gentlemen, Ye do not fair by Dr.* Ruſſel, *ye ought* to give him liberty to offer his Arguments, and when he hath done, then to make the beſt of them. And, I ſuppoſe, it was for this piece of Service, that his Copy was by them afterwards look'd upon to be but as *a Lawyers Breviate, containing only hints for Memory*, as they ſlight it. *Append. to Nar.* p. 56.

Next, when they would have ſet Mr. *Williams* and the *Doctor* at a difference about their different Opinions, Dr. *Ruſſel* replied, *If I am not of his Opinion, I am of yours, Sir*, (ſpeaking to Mr. *Robinſon.*) Then Mr. *Williams* ſaid, *If you ſay an hundred times as much more as you do, you ſhall not ſet the* Doctor *and I together by the ears:* And here they fell a laughing, ſhewing their Rudeneſs.

Again, when Dr. *Ruſſel* gave them the liberty of the whole New Teſtament to prove Infant-ſprinkling was any part of the Counſel of God, I ſaid, *They might take it any where, from* Geneſis *to the* Revelation, *if they could but prove it.* Hereupon Mr. *Robinſon* rudely ſaid, *What, Sir, the New Teſtament in* Geneſis? But Mr. *Williams* reply'd, *Yes, Sir, the New Teſtament is in* Geneſis: To which he made no Anſwer. And here I will take notice of their words, *pag.* 66. *So that Infants may be baptized, if we can bring good Proof for it out of the* other parts *of holy*

Writ. Here these Gentlemen forgot that there was given them such large liberty to prove their Practice out of any part of the written Word: but, as they did nothing then, so they have done nothing since by their printing, *to bring any good Proof for their Infant-sprinkling out of any part of the Old or New Testament*; and therefore I must conclude they cannot find it in Holy Writ: for they have been in their Studies before and since, and they knew what they were to be engaged in; and if they had not been prepared before the Dispute, they should have taken better care since.

Also there was much said upon *Mat.* 3. 7. and *Luke* 3. 7. between Mr. *Robinson* and my self; and if any of their Notaries have taken it (or any thing else that will serve their turn) let them bring it out if they please, yet so as not to wrong me: For I do deny that my Reply, which they have put down, *p.* 40. was to Mr. *Leigh*, for it was to Mr. *Robinson*, and I never spake the words as they are there put down to my wrong; it was so much of it that I did then speak, that I do not remember all that I said to him, but yet this I do remember of the words, *That all that appear to be a visible Generation of Vipers ought to be cast out of the Church, that is to say, without they repent.* He did confess that they did suspend them for a time: And I replied, *By the Rules of Christ such ought to be excommunicated, and they did not act according to Rule, if they did not do it.*

Further, when upon *Acts* 15. 10. I spoke, they need not stand so long upon the former part of the Chapter, the 9*th* Verse would clear who were the Subjects, and repeated the words: Mr. *Robinson* interrupted me, saying, *Sir, where are you now?* I replied, *If I have transgressed the Rule of a Moderator, I would ask the Peoples Pardon.* Thus neither I nor those

thoſe of us that were to ſpeak in the Diſpute could ſpeak, but he was ready to interrupt us; tho all there preſent may remember that we acted towards them very ſoberly: but had we done otherwiſe, I do not queſtion but you would have heard of it before now.

They made an Apology of their not being willing to have a publick Diſpute before the People; and I having heard ſomething of that the night before, told it to ſome of our People there: they told me that they would have diſputed them in private, if they would have diſcourſed it according to the Scripture. When they were thus making their Apology, I replied, that they might have had it in private, if they would have diſcourſed it according to the Scriptures, and that they had been offered it before we came thither: This they could not deny, and alledged no further; and yet they would plead their Innocency ſince on purpoſe to blame us.

Mr. *Leigh* offered to argue it with me, but I replied, *I thought Dr.* Ruſſel *and Mr.* Williams *were able to manage their own Arguments, and therefore there was no need of that:* Yet I have been heartily ſorry ſince, that I did not offer then to change a plain Propoſition with any of thoſe our Oppoſers, it being ſo fair an opportunity to bring you to the Scripture, by which means the People would have had more light into the Truth. And when the Arguments on our part were brought to bear, and were back'd by the Scriptures, I deſired our Oppoſites to grant, or deny, or diſtinguiſh, or give another ſenſe of the Scriptures, but they would give none.

When Mr. *Robinſon* was giving the aforeſaid unfair Repreſentation to the People, I deſired he would forbear, if not, I would oppoſe him; and yet he went on (as he uſed to do in the Diſpute) and gave

a further account to the People. I desired him again to desist, and if he would not, I could not, nor would forbear him: but, if he would give the *Doctor* leave to speak for himself, I would forbear; and so with much ado *I did get him to forbear.*

When I was called upon to conclude in Prayer, and it was said it was my place, Mr. *Robinson* would not leave off, but as he began, so he did continue to the end, and said it would be but vain Repetitions if he should: I replied, I would offer no vain Repetitions for them; I hop'd I made Conscience of the Duty of Prayer as much as they did elsewhere, and I would not do it there for them.

And now I would not have them talk too much of their *Copy*, and condemn others; I would have them to remember, that Mr. *Smith* was not capable to repeat one of the *Doctor*'s Arguments when he was call'd upon to do it, after that Mr. *Liegh* had denied one part of it, and the *Doctor* desired him to repeat it, and he could not do it, which the *Doctor* improv'd upon him, and said, Do you not know what you deny? And if he fail'd in the present, I know not what he might do afterwards: But I do not question their Abilities to help him out. And as for Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, they pretend in their Narrative to find a multitude of Falshoods, Additions, Alterations and Omissions in it; but nevertheless it is judged that he is as good a Writer as the other; and as for their Narrative, it will be particularly examined by the *Doctor* himself; and how many such faults he will find there, our Opposers may judg themselves, that have gone so large as they have done. They have made them speak on our side as mean as ever they can, and as full for their own. But I believe that all who look into the *nature* of the management of the Matter and the Arguments, will fall in with

those

thoſe that are moſt agreeable to the Word of God, and are fairly drawn from thence. For, I hope, all Perſons will conſider, that if our Oppoſers had Arguments offered them by ſuch mean Men as they have repreſented the old Gentleman to be; what would they have done if they had had Men that had been thorowly furniſhed for that work? The leſs they make us, I think they make themſelves the more mean. Could they not much eaſier have overturned their Arguments without ſo many Reflections? Can they think that will credit their Cauſe, or make them look greater? Doth this agree with that Character which the *Poſt-man* gave of the *Doctor*, as oppoſing Infant-Baptiſm with all the Subtilty and Sophiſtry of the Schools? Surely that doth not agree with this diminutive Deſcription they now give of him: They could know little of his Abilities in the ſacred Languages, for they did not diſcourſe much at that time out of any of them; and if they had, what advantage would it have been to them to have known one anothers Abilities in the Languages, unleſs they could have convinc'd him by their Abilities? But tho they profeſs to have them, neither he nor others that wanted Conviction from them, had it by their giving us one inſtance of Precept or Precedent for their Practice of ſprinkling Infants, inſtead of baptizing or dipping them when Adult Believers, that it was either commanded or practiſed by Chriſt or his Apoſtles: for I my ſelf ſhould have been glad to have received Conviction then or now by their Writing, if it have any foundation in the Word of God; and yet it ſeems they would have us believe it without, and blame us for not believing it upon their word. We could eaſily believe it, if it was as eaſy for them to prove and maintain it, as commanded or grounded in the revealed Will of God, to be obſerv'd and

practiſed by them and us. But until I receive ſuch convincing Light and Satisfaction from them out of the Word of God as the Rule for our Practice in this matter, I ſhall, notwithſtanding their Abilities in Languages, and for all what they have ſaid as yet in the Diſpute, or written ſince in their Account of it, continue in the ſame mind, and the ſame Practice, when thoſe that believe do tender themſelves to be baptized, according to the Practice of the Apoſtles. If you, Gentlemen, that are our Oppoſites, or any of you can ſtill convincingly prove, that your Practice has any Precept or Precedent in the Word of God, I will own it to be of Divine Inſtitution: In the mean while this plain Argument for our contrary Faith ſhall ſatisfy me.

If Infant-Baptiſm hath neither Precept nor Precedent in the Word of God, then 'tis not of Divine Inſtitution:

But Infant-Baptiſm hath neither Precept nor Precedent in the Word of God;

Therefore it is not of Divine Inſtitution.

When you have prov'd your Practice as we have done ours, then you will have a great many more of your ſide; and till then, you ought to deal more kindly and fairly by us than you have hitherto done, eſpecially in the Diſpute, as I have partly ſhew'd: and I muſt needs ſay, I am afraid you will not hereafter deal ſo kindly and fairly by us as you ſhould, ſince you charge the dead with that which is falſe, and yet pretend *to tread ſoftly over his Grave*, pag. 62. for immediately in the next words you give us Mr. *Farrel*'s Miſrepreſentation againſt Mr. *Williams* (now dead) there are two Witneſſes that were with him, and they wrote it down as Mr. *Farrel* ſpake it: and I my ſelf had it from the old Gentleman's own mouth in the preſence of ſeveral Witneſſes, together with his

Argu-

Arguments, and carried them to Dr. *Russel*; and I have sufficient reason to believe it is true, and that he has abused neither Mr. *Francis Williams* nor Mr. *Farrel* in what he has said of them; and all that knew him, did know he was as able as most Men to retain what he had heard, and to give an account of it, but more especially, when others with him took such particular care to put it down in Writing, that they might not be mistaken in any thing afterwards. I believe that poor Story had never come into print, had old Mr. *John Williams* been living.

Furthermore, I would have the World judg between us (or at least those that are both judicious and unprejudiced, and so able to judg between us and our Oppolites) how that *pag.* 66. they condemn our Arguments by wholesale, speaking in these words, *All the Arguments they offer'd were trifling Cavils.* Now I would have you, Readers, to consider, Is not this a very easy way of refuting to condemn *all*, when they are not able to answer *one* of them? Ye may see from hence whether it be they or we that did trifle: For in the next foregoing *Page* you may see how they do particularize the matter, and say it is false (tho what of it is so, those that are concerned in it may look to it, as in the case of Brother *Duke.*) Now in that Passage (*pag.* 65.) this is to be minded (to observe how well it does agree with what they say elsewhere); they say in these words, *But that none of us would refuse to dip a Person in such a case, is true: We never pleaded against dipping as one way, but as the only way; not against its Lawfulness, but Necessity.* And yet presently after they tell you, *that the Anabaptists Cause does rest on weak unscriptural Principles, how loudly soever they pretend to Scripture.* Now I must say, if our Cause, *viz.* of *dipping Believers*, be weak and unscriptural, they ought then to plead against it, and

refuse

refuſe the doing of it, which it ſeems they do not do by their own Confeſſion aforementioned, but on the other hand they in plain words grant its Lawfulneſs. Now if it be lawful, that is, conſiſtent with, and agreeable to the Command of God and Chriſt, and the Practice of the Apoſtles, then it cannot be unſcriptural, nor our Principles ſo weak as they would make them in the Eyes of thoſe who are for our Cauſe, and own our Principles, tho theſe Men make ſo loud a noiſe againſt them as weak and unſcriptural. We oppoſe the Principle and Practice of our Antagoniſts as unſcriptural, weak, and unlawful, in ſo far as it is neither commanded by God or Chriſt, nor implied as ſo commanded by any ſcriptural Precedent. But if they will evade our arguing, and ſay, as they ſeem to do in their forecited words, That our *Principles* and *Practice* of *baptizing or dipping Believers is ſcriptural indeed*, but it is not the *only ſcriptural way*, but there is a *ſecond* ſcriptural way, *viz.* of *dipping thoſe that do not believe*, *as Infants do not*, by the preaching of the Word; *and alſo a third*, *of ſprinkling thoſe that do believe*, *together with Infants that do not believe:* and that theſe other ways are intended in the Command of Chriſt, and implied by this or that Precedent as commanded, and conſequently are as well ſcriptural ways, as that of dipping Believers is (for this is the Queſtion now between us) I ſay, if they can prove theſe other ways as diſtinct or different from ours, to be alſo ſcriptural, *i. e.* intended in the Command of Chriſt, and implied by ſome Precedent in Scripture, let them produce it if they can do it, for they have never done it yet: If they cannot, then theirs ſhall be their own darling Notion, and they have no reaſon to charge ours as our darling Notion, unleſs they can prove that their bare *ipſe dixit*, or *ſay-ſo*, is ſufficient proof againſt us that deny

deny it. And indeed we need do no more than to deny this their *darling* and unſcriptural Practice and *Notion*, till they are able to prove it: Becauſe he that will not only affirm, but alſo convince another of his Principle and Practice as commanded in Scripture, ought in all reaſon to prove it to be ſo, 'ere he can blame another that denies it, that he hugs a darling Notion in his Boſom. Set the caſe ſome Papiſts ſhould blame theſe Gentlemen that are our *Antagoniſts* for diſowning the Baptiſm of Bells as being unſcriptural, would it not be ſufficient for them to ſay, that it is no where commanded in Scripture by any expreſs Command, or any Practice that implies ſuch a Command? And if the other ſhould demand a Prohibition or Command to the contrary, or elſe they would continue to blame them as hugging a darling Notion, a weak and unſcriptural Principle, would our *Oppoſites* not think this very unreaſonable and weak? Well then, I do not queſtion their Ability in making the Application in our caſe: For, if it be good in them, it's ſo in us.

Further, how do theſe their *Reflections* aforementioned, and the *Introduction* to their Narrative agree together? For in the beginning of that *Introduction* (which I ſuppoſe was penn'd by Mr. *Chandler*) are theſe words, *Muſt I again be call'd out to engage in this irkſome and unpleaſing Controverſy? who had much rather ſpend my time in healing Differences, and provoking all Chriſtians to love one another*; and then follow ſome Expreſſions of Arch-biſhop *Tillotſon*. But O! had he or they taken Dr. *Tillotſon* for their Pattern, to write after his Copy indeed, I am perſwaded we ſhould have been more fairly and charitably treated by them, or by this Prefacer in particular than we are. For, we have a Paſſage cited by the *Doctor*, p. 59. where that great Man Dr. *Tillotſon*

lotſon does ſay, *Antiently thoſe who were baptized put off their Garments.* Now this ſaying is ſo far from ridiculing us or our Practice uncharitably, that it makes for us; for he does not ſay they expoſed their Modeſty by putting off their Garments; nor does he there trifle as they do about the *Eunuch*, p. 81. And whereas in the ſaid Introduction there follows theſe words, *I had much rather be dreſſing my own Soul for Eternity, and preparing others for thoſe calm and peaceable Regions, where perfect Charity and Good-will reign for ever, than in fomenting and increaſing thoſe Diviſions among Chriſtians which are too unmeaſurably wide already*; I do wiſh with all my heart all of them had put this deſire in execution: I for my part would not have hinder'd them, nor do I know any that would that are concerned on our ſide in this Controverſy, wherein our Antagoniſts have not only not preſſed after that *Charity* and *Good-will* the *Introduction* ſpeaks of, but alſo (I think) have laid a foundation for a greater Diviſion, unleſs God by his Power and Providence over-rule our Spirits on both ſides: For they have expoſed us and the Truth wherein we differ from them, as very ridiculous and trifling: However, the Truth which we believe we cannot part with, we are to buy the Truth and ſell it not; and inſtead of making us to part with it, they have rather given us more ground to believe it to be Truth.

Mr. *Chandler*, p. 2. begins the Abridgment of his Sermons thus, *Here I muſt unavoidably dip my Pen in the watry Controverſy: I love not to meddle with Matters of Diſpute.* It is a ſign he does not (if I may ſay ſo) or elſe he had not lov'd to meddle with the matter of the Controverſy which Dr. *Ruſſel* had with Mr. *Allen* about *ſinging*; I ſuppoſe neither was at his Sermons, and what ſhould make him bring their Controverſy in thither, I do not well ſee, unleſs he loved

to

to defame Dr. *Russel*. He says indeed there, *p.* 12. that he mentions it *to convince Mr.* Webber *and his Adherents, what a doughty Champion they have chosen for themselves.* But you may see thereby the *Charity* and *Good-will* he has towards us and Dr. *Russel* in special, notwithstanding his pretence that he aim'd at some Conviction, tho he might very well know that this exposing Dr. *Russel* behind his back so publickly about the point of *singing*, and drolling upon him as a Hackny Disputant, at a time when it did become Mr. *Chandler* to be more solid and serious, would signify nothing at all for any Conviction in the Point of Baptism. If Dr. *Russel* had been out in that Point, it will not follow he is in this. However, if Mr. *Chandler* had not only mentioned Dr. *Russel's* Arguments in that Point, but also had taken off the strength of his Arguments, Mr. *Allen* perhaps would have had reason to have given him Thanks for it. To slight them as Mr. *Chandler* does there, *p.* 13. by saying, *These were the Arguments for want of better he trifled with at* Portsmouth, was not to answer them: For, tho Mr. *Chandler* says in the Page before, that Dr. *R. advances the very same Arguments against the Practice of singing Psalms, which he does against theirs for Infant-Baptism*; yet he may know in his Conscience there were more, and they were all in my opinion so good against his Practice of Infant-sprinkling, that he was not able to answer them as he should, nor any of the other that were present to help him. But by reason I have told him so before, I needed not to have told it him now again, but that there was some occasion for it; and I might have added, that I think he and his Helpers had rather need to cry to others, *Come and help us* (as in that 12*th* Page he has the like words) for the help he has had already, does him little Service to overthrow our Cause, and to con-

convince Mr. *Webber*, *and his Adherents* (as he calls them) out of it *. But if others are called to assist him, it may do him perhaps more Service, to wit, to moderate him, and make him write more fairly and handsomly of his mistaken Brethren, as he counts us. I wish he had kept to that Language, and then we had not had all that Railery, Reflecting, and Trifling that was and is used by him. Mr. *Chandler*, who was it that trifled with *incompleat Disciples*, you or we? Who gave Mr. *Ridge*'s matter a full account, you or we? I know, and am satisfied, that the *Doctor* has given a true account of it, and in his own words, as near as words can be spoken.

* *But I hope Mr.* Webber *is not to be taken off from the Truth he hath owned by their ridiculing the* Doctor *and his Arguments, nor to continue in that wherein he hath not sufficient warrant to bear him out in the Word of God. I hope Mr.* Webber *is not so easy a Man as to be thus prevailed upon by him.*

I heard a Gentleman say that Mr. *Chandler* was a Fool, and deserved to be knocked about the Ears; he ought to have accepted the Argument, and given his Instance, which himself would have done if he had been there.

Whatever Mr. *Chandler* may suppose, I am sure his refusing to give an Instance upon an universal Negative (when so often prest to do it) neither made for his own Credit, nor yet for the Credit of his Cause: For, it made others conclude he could not do it, and that if he could, he would have condescended to have done it in so publick an Assembly, if he had been furnished with any to have given. But the plain truth is, as he could not *then* give us so much as *one* single Instance for his Practice, so he hath not been able to do it since: for if he could, we should have had it.

For,

For, in a Point of that moment it is a ſhame for him now to excuſe it with this or that Nicety in Diſputation, which (whatever he may think) rather ſhews, that he aims at and ſtrives more for maſtery in controverting, than that he himſelf doth heartily believe his own Practice to be ſcriptural; for, if he had ſo done, he would have condeſcended to any method to clear up that which he preaches for Truth, and pretends to have ſuch a hearty deſire to convince us of.

There was another ſaid, he did not underſtand what was an incompleat Diſciple of Chriſt; and yet he is one that underſtands an Argument (in my opinion) as well as Mr. *Chandler*, tho he did not *then* walk with us, nor the other neither. His incompleat Diſciples are ſuch as the Scripture never taught him to call ſo; and (I think) Mr. *Chandler* is groſly miſtaken to ſuppoſe he has by this trifling Diſtinction ſalv'd the Credit of his abſurd way of vindicating his Practice, and thereby evaded the ſtrength of our Arguments: For, they that are ſerious and judicious Chriſtians can eaſily diſcern it to be a fallacious and evaſive ſhift, to caſt a Veil over the Minds of thoſe that are ignorant of this Controverſy, and do not allow themſelves the liberty to examine it: For it is wholly unſcriptural, and groundleſs, and impertinent, as it is applied by him in the Caſe under Conſideration.

But further: What a ſtir do theſe Men make about the word *equivocable*: If there were two Letters added at the Preſs, or (to ſuppoſe the worſt) that it were wrong ſpelt, it had been the Corrector's place to have mended it. It was very much there had not been more than *one* Error in *miſpelling* in the *Doctor*'s Narrative; for it's too common a fault in printing. And it is to be obſerv'd, that there is no *Errata* made

to

to the *Doctor*'s, there being few or no faults in it. But they were forced to make an *Errata* at the end of their own Book, which (by their own Confeſſion) hath more Errors in it than they have noted, which they excuſe by ſaying, they can create no difficulty to an intelligent Reader: And they alſo tell us of ſeveral Letters dropt out in working, *&c.* which if any complain of, they may charge it partly on the different Inclination of the Corrector, and partly on the difficulty of bringing our common Printers to any Exactneſs.

If by a Corrector of a different Inclination they mean a Baptiſt, the *Doctor* ſaith he doth not believe it; for (if he be not miſinformed) he is a Man of their Perſwaſion in the Point in Controverſy: But this he is certain of, that the Gentleman who corrected his Copy when at the Preſs, is a zealous Member of the Church of *England*, and (to his knowledg) a Contender for Infant-Baptiſm; and yet he muſt give him this Character, that he was very faithful to the Truſt repoſed in him. But an overſight may be by the beſt of Men: But he is under a diſadvantage about it where to charge it, becauſe the written Copy was never returned. But it is ſo inſignificant a Trifle to what (they confeſs) is in their own, that it's not worth contending about: And certainly it deſerved no ſuch ridiculous and baſe deſcanting on it, as to call it a word of the famous *Doctor*'s own coining, with other Expreſſions which they in their Spleen have vented againſt him. Is this their Charity and Good-will towards us? Surely, a little Charity would have ſerv'd to have excuſed ſo inconſiderable a fault; eſpecially, when they only gueſs that he was chargeable with it; not knowing but it might be an Error of the Preſs, ſeeing there were ſo many in their own which they boldly charge upon the Corrector and Printer.

But

But they have not yet done with it; for they say, if he intend equivocal Expressions, they are his own peculiar Talent: Perhaps few Jesuits herein equal or exceed him at that sort of Weapon. I cannot but wonder (Gentlemen) that you should thus proceed in this manner, what can it be that thus moves you to speak against the *Doctor?* Doth this agree with that Charity you speak of (to those you call mistaken Brethren) in the beginning of your Book? Can you think that he deserved that Character from you (when you call to mind with what coolness of Spirit, and evenness of Temper he behaved himself, during the whole time of the Disputation) I appeal to your own Consciences whether you think he deserved such an uncharitable Insinuation and severe Reflection? Doth this also agree with Mr. *Chandler's* short Request, *p.* 2. that God would grant that Truth may prevail? Surely, this doth not shew you had any design it should prevail upon the *Doctor*, and upon us, either then or since; for your Practice contradicts your Expressions hitherto. I know not what you may do for time to come: But if you go on as you have begun, I fear you may give the Government occasion to repent of allowing the liberty you speak of: At least you may have cause to repent of allowing your selves such a liberty as ye do against us.

Who was it that trifled about the Mother of our Lord being a Believer, you or we? And who fairly improved it to the World, you or we? What reason had Mr. *Leigh* to allow the Eunuch to be a Christian, and consider him as such, altho (as he saith) he was but a Proselyte of the Gate? And yet in *p.* 31. to deny (in his sense) the Virgin *Mary* to be a Christian, and represent her a Jew, distinct from that of a Christian, and that Christianity in that sense had then no being. There were many Believers in Christ

 through-

throughout the ſeveral Ages of the World, both before the Jewiſh Oeconomy, as well under it, witneſs *Enoch* the 7*th* from *Adam*, who propheſied of him, *Jude* 14, 15. And were not *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, with all the reſt mentioned in *Heb.* 11. with many others, true Believers in Chriſt? This you know is not to be denied. And are not all true Believers in Chriſt real Chriſtians? And ſhall the Mother of our Lord be denied this Appellation? when the holy Scripture calls her a Believer in Chriſt, *Luke* 2. from *v.* 30, to *v.* 35. where it is thus written, *And bleſſed is ſhe that hath believed:* And Mr. *Leigh then* confeſſed it.

The Anſwer therefore Mr. *Williams* gave to your Demand was good and proper, altho you thus trifle with it ſince, and change the word from what was then ſpoken: For, by what hath been ſaid you may ſee that if it had been the word Chriſtian, as it was not, yet if ſhe was a Believer, then a Chriſtian; for all true Believers in Chriſt, whether Jews or Gentiles, are Diſciples; and you know the Diſciples were called Chriſtians. And altho that Name was firſt given at *Antioch*, yet they had the thing before the Name was brought into uſe, and impoſed upon them.

And altho they then offered, upon giving you ſuch an inſtance, to give us the Cauſe: Yet I do not think they were willing either then or now to give it us, for they have no mind to part with their Practice; for, if they had, they would not have uſed ſuch poor ſhifts as they have done to ſupport it. And amongſt other Artifices they have made uſe of, this was one, to ſend a Certificate (before their Book was printed) down to *Froome* by the hands of *Thomas Smithwick* and *Hugh Wats*; and I doubt not but the Men are ſo honeſt, that they would not bring ſuch a thing, if it had not been given them ſo to do:

And

And the World shall have it in the same words as I had it delivered to me in my own House.

Mr. *Chandler's* and Mr. *Leigh's* Certificate.

" THese are to certify all whom it may concern, " That Dr. *Russel's* Narrative of the *Portsmouth* " Disputation is full of palpable notorious Falshoods, " and that there are many Alterations, Additions and " Omissions, even from Mr. *Samuel Ring's* own Co- " py which he hath honestly given to us. We can " procure the hands of vast numbers both of the " Church of *England* and Dissenters, and some Ana- " baptists themselves, that will acknowledg we ob- " tain'd an intire Victory. The Governor and Mayor " have promised their Testimonials, but being both " now at *London*, we cannot send them at present, " but shall publish with all convenient speed a full " Answer to Dr. *Russel's* Book, with the Attestations " of the principal Gentlemen present: Therefore we " humbly desire all Persons would suspend their Judg- " ment of this matter till they have a view of our " Answer.

Signed by

Portsmouth, June 1. 1699. *Sam. Chandler*, *Will. Leigh.*

And now I hope, Reader, that Mr. *Chandler* and Mr. *Leigh* will not be angry for spending our Judgment upon their Narrative, themselves giving us that liberty, as (I suppose) is implied by this Certificate: For, altho it was sent to their own Friends, yet it being directed to all whom it may concern, I have reason to think it concerns me. But I am sure it did concern them to make it appear that the *Doctor's* Narrative was such as they have represented it to be,

which I am certain they have not yet done. Had they procured those vast numbers both of the Church of *England* and Dissenters, and also some Anabaptists (as they are pleased to call us, tho they know we disown both the Name and the Thing thereby signified) that would have acknowledged under their hands, that our Antagonists had obtained an intire Victory; and if upon examination they had been found to be Persons of Credit and Reputation, such as they promise by their Certificate, then they would have gained more by that, than they have done by all those undue Reflections they have cast upon us: For, such a course of Procedure serves rather to convince the sober and judicious, that they have taken this method to blast our Reputation, because they knew not how otherwise to evade the force of our Arguments against them, nor to justify their own Practice of Infant-sprinkling: for that had been their proper business, if they could have done it.

They say in their Certificate, the Governor and Mayor have *promised* their *Testimonials*. The Mayor's we have not, nor yet the Governor's, to any thing more than what relates to that first Advertisment that was put into the *Post-man*; and I expected they would have done as they promised. Gentlemen, will you thus adventure to charge the Governor and Mayor with Promise-breaking? I think that to be worse than to give his Honour a diminutive Title (as you phrase it) And to give the Mayor a Title that is thought (by some) to be above him. That will not repair the damage he may sustain in being represented by you as a Promise-breaker. But I think he is more a Man than to do such a thing as that, nowithstanding what you say in your Certificate.

As touching Colonel *Gibson* I do, and shall thank his Honour for staying till the Dispute was ended;

and

and also those Gentlemen that perswaded him to it, if that which is said be true, that they told him, if he went off there was danger lest the provoked Multitude should do Dr. *Russel* some mischief: But this (like other things) depends upon their bare Affirmation, and how much Credit may from thence be given to it, we must leave to the Reader to consider. For my own part, I have so much Charity for the Church-of-*England* People there present, that I cannot think, by any thing I could observe, that they had the least inclination to do the *Doctor* any Mischief. And as for our own People, I am sure they had no cause for it, if we take the *Doctor*'s Argument as it is in it self, separate from Mr. *Robinson*'s perverse Misconstruction and Misrepresentation of it. But as the *Doctor* did, so (we hope) we also know better things than what Mr. *Robinson* hath abusively put upon the *Doctor*'s words: For we can and do make a difference between the nature of our Children, and that of Pigs and Dogs. But it is their business, and Mr. *Robinson*'s in particular, to make a difference between what God can do in an extraordinary manner by his immediat operation upon Infants; and what can be done for, and upon them mediately, by the Ministry of Men, and that before they have the use and exercise of Reason: For they know his Argument was this,

If Infants are capable to be made Disciples of Christ by the Ministry of Men, without the use of Reason; then the Beasts of the Field are also capable.

But the Beasts of the Field are not capable:

Therefore Infants are not capable.

Now, as I may appeal to the judgment of all sober, judicious and unprejudiced Christians about this Argument, without supposing that any of them will put such a Construction upon it as Mr. *Robinson* hath done, that it carries with it a full Comparison with-

out exception, betwixt the Human Nature of Infants, and the beaſtly Nature of Brutes; when they do but conſider that it was uſed by way of Retortion only: So I may alſo appeal to the Conſciences of Mr. *Robinſon* and his Aſſiſtants, whether they could poſſibly imagine from hence, that the honeſt intent and meaning of Dr. *Ruſſel's* Argument was ſuch as they repreſented it to be, in *pag.* 75. of their Book: As having thereby ſet our Infants upon a level with Brutes, and that there is no difference between our Children and our Dogs; and this to be his fixed Opinion, as they expreſs it: And this after he had declared himſelf ſo fully to the contrary in his printed Narrative. For, altho they might pretend to have forgot what he ſaid about it in the Diſpute; or, their Paſſion might have hinder'd their Underſtandings from being imployed as they ought in their attendance upon it; yet when they had it before them in print, wherein he hath vindicated himſelf from ſuch a Miſconſtruction, I cannot ſee but they muſt needs know his true intent and meaning therein.

And, for my part, I believe all that read this Argument, and conſider what the *Doctor* hath ſaid about Infants, will be of my mind: Eſpecially if they conſider what Mr. *Williams* ſaid concerning Infants, That they had a Right and Title to Glory by the free Grace of God, and the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt. And let me add but one thing, that they are made meet for it by the work of the Spirit, which (to us) is altogether ſecret. But it never came into our Hearts to imagine any ſuch Privileges to be intended as a Donation for the Beaſts of the Field.

And if after all this, theſe Men ſhall ſtill perſiſt in it, and charge either the *Doctor* (or any of us) as they do him in their Narrative, that it is our fixed opinion, that there is no diſparity, no difference, no unlike-

unlikeneſs at all between our Infants and the Beaſts of the Fields, notwithſtanding all that hath been ſaid by us to the contrary, how can we help it? But this I deſire the Reader to obſerve, that in *pag.* 76. where theſe words are, there are alſo words which they cite out of his Apology, that will teſtify in their Conſciences that he allowed a diſparity: And that the Parity implied in his Argument was only in a certain reſpect, as hath been already mentioned. But what may not Uncharitableneſs and Ill-will do, when ſuch Men are reſolved to pervert the words of him they contend with? And altho you talk never ſo highly of your Charity in the beginning of your Book, yet your Words and Actions to the contrary make it appear to be no other than an empty ſound. For, a ſmall meaſure of true Chriſtian Charity would have enabled you to diſcern that groſs Uncharitableneſs and Ill-will againſt the *Doctor*, which you have ſo often diſcovered in your Reflections on his Narrative.

What miſchief therefore it ſhould be ſuppoſed the Multitude ſhould do the *Doctor* (as you intimate, *pag.* 75, 76.) I know not; nor yet from whom it ſhould come, unleſs from your own Party: For the reſt of the People were very civil to us, they made no diſturbance at our going off, nor any attempts when we were in the Street; altho all the thanks they have from you is, to call them the provok'd Multitude. Whereas, if it had been true, the blame muſt have lain upon Mr. *Robinſon*, who did uſe his Endeavour to provoke them; but as it was altogether without cauſe on our part, ſo it proved to be without ſucceſs with reſpect to the People, who departed in a quiet and peaceable manner.

The Church of *England* hath leſs reaſon to be offended with us than with you: for, we deny nothing

to their Children, that we allow our selves to do for our own. If their Children are sick, we pray for them, if desired, *&c.* But it is you that put an affront upon those of that Communion by your Practice: For, whereas you say you baptize the Children of Believers, consider'd as such; and yet some of your Party have made some scruple of baptizing those whose Parents are not Members with you (as I have been inform'd) Do you think that all Parents in the Church of *England* are Unbelievers? And altho you profess to have a large latitude, it may be more than others of your Brethren; yet you do not often baptize their Children, which gives some seeming intimation, as if you made such a distinction betwixt your Children and theirs.

For our parts, we look upon our Children to have no more from us by Generation, than the Children of others have from them. And I dare not say (as you intimate in your Book) that the Line of Election runs to the Believers Seed. For, I know many that have been converted, and yet their Parents (to all visible appearance) were unconverted. Nay, the Children have been instrumental in the hand of God, for the good of their Parents: And (on the contrary) some Godly Parents have had very Ungodly Children, to the great grief and sorrow of their Souls.

Now therefore, if there was any cause for the Multitude (as you call them) to be offended, it is most likely to be at what you said (and not what the *Doctor* then said) that you should look upon them as Unbelievers; for so you do by your Practice and Writing, tho other things are pretended by you.

I would not have any think I am against the Doctrine of Election, I hope I own it as a Truth: And when your Children and mine come to be regenerated, it is a sure Character they were elected. And where-

as

as you talk of the Parents Faith being imputed to their Children; I must tell you plainly, I have heard of the Righteousness of Christ being imputed, but never that the Faith of the Parent was imputed to the Children before. It may be you will say, you do but suppose it; or, why may it not be so? It's the same method indeed that Mr. *Chandler* takes in his Sermons: But in my judgment, it is a way to make Men turn Atheists and Deists, and to ridicule all Revealed Religion, to make the holy Scriptures a nose of Wax, to serve your turns. I beg of you for time to come, to leave off such ways and methods, and to argue upon a firm and more certain Foundation.

But you proceed further in your Certificate, and say you will give a full Answer to Dr. *Russel*'s Book.

If you had perform'd your Promise herein (as you have not) I do believe I should have been of your mind.

Neither have you been so good as your word in giving us the Attestations of the principal Gentlemen then present at your intire Victory, unless by them you mean Mr. *Smith*, Mr. *Maultbey*, and Mr. *Will. Wallen*, whom you produce as Witnesses in your Book: And if so, how can these be the principal Gentlemen present? And if they are, where be the Attestations under their hands, that you obtained an intire Victory at the Dispute? Or, is there any else hath done it? We find no such in your Book. I would have you that are so rigid in charging Dr. *Russel*'s Narrative as false, by reason of some Omissions (as you say) in it; (whereas he was not willing, if he could have done it, to trouble the World with all those passionate Expressions that past from Mr. *Robinson*, or others, that were of little concern to the World, lest he should have made it swell into too great a Volume; even as I my self think it not convenient

to

to make this my Writing ſwell with the ſeveral Remarks that might be made on many other Paſſages of your Book, leſt it be made too chargeable for the Purſes of our poor People.) I would, I ſay, have you and others conſider whether the ſame Objection doth not fall as heavy upon your ſelves, ſeeing you have not performed your Promiſe under your hands, but have omitted to give us thoſe Teſtimonials: But I ſuppoſe you were not able to obtain ſuch a Teſtimony from thoſe Gentlemen, or elſe we ſhould have had it in your Book.

But there is one thing I would remark, which is this, That in *p.* 70. of your Narrative, you uſe this Expreſſion, *That falſe Lie.* Now altho I do not allow your Charge to be true, yet ſuppoſe it had, could not you, by all your Learning and Skill, have found out an Expreſſion leſs liable to exception? Pray, Sirs, when did you ever read or hear of a true Lie, that you tell the World this is a falſe Lie? Are there any Lies that are not falſe? Now I think this deſerves as much notice as that of the addition of a Letter, and much more. And yet how ſtrangely did you improve that againſt the *Doctor:* But I ſhall not deal ſo by you.

Thus, Reader, I hope I have made it appear how our Antagoniſts have no reaſon to boaſt ſo boldly as they have done of a Victory at the Diſpute. But whereas on the other hand, they charge it as an egregious *Falſhood* on Dr. *Ruſſel*, p. 64. as if he had *boldly publiſhed amongſt and by his Friends in* London *(tho not in his Narrative)* that *he, to put it out of doubt, and his Friends had carried the day at* Portſmouth, *added, the Biſhop of* Salisbury *had received a Letter from Colonel* GIBSON, *wherein he applauded our Performance.* Now for the undeceiving of the World I think good further to add, that I charged the

Doctor

Doctor with this Report (for which his said Enemies call him in the place aforecited, *a Falsifier of Reports*) but he told me he never said so, nor thought so, and therefore it must rest upon the Asserter, till he can bring forth his Evidence that the *Doctor* said so, and that it was from thence that such a Report has spread abroad. However, this may serve as another Instance of their Spleen and Virulency against him, and how eager they are to snatch at any thing to asperse him, and to render him little, yea to degrade him in the highest manner. And hence it is that they cannot forbear to trifle with his being a Graduate, as in the last quoted Page: Wherefore for the satisfaction of some Persons that may have read their Reflections on him and his Degree, I shall here add the Certificate following, together with some other Certificates that I have lately procured, or have been sent to me out of the Country.

" WHereas it is render'd doubtful by the Presbyterian Ministers in their account of the *Portsmouth* Disputation, whether *William Russel* be a Graduate Doctor in Physick of the famous University of *Cambridg*: These are to certify whom it may concern, that we whose Names are under-written have seen his *Diploma*, with the Seal of that University thereunto affixed; and concluding with these words, *Dat. Cantabr. in Senatu nostro.* Given in our Senate at *Cambridg*, June 11. 1688. Witness our Hands,

William Salmon, *James Halsey*,
Francis Salmon, *Edward Jarvis*,
John Wells, *John Sharpe*.

I have also seen a Book, entituled, *A Register of the Doctors of Physick in our two Universities of* Cambridg *and*

and Oxford, Printed *Anno* 1695. diligently and carefully collected out of the Regiſters of both thoſe Univerſities; beginning at 1659. and ending with 1694. incluſive: With the Names of thoſe that were created Doctors in Phyſick during that time (which is 35 years) placed both in an Annual and Alphabetical Order. In both which I find Dr. *William Ruſſel*'s Name inſerted in its due place and order.

From whence it is evident that Dr. *Ruſſel* is in the right, and themſelves in the wrong: And alſo it ſerves to diſcover another miſtake of theirs, which they (through their ignorance) charge upon him, *viz.* for ſaying the *Senate* at *Cambridg*, which they call a word of his own coining, and do greatly ridicule him for it; whereas it appears by his own *Diploma*, that the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors and Heads of Colleges, *&c.* (when aſſembled) do call themſelves a *Senate*.

Beſides, the *Doctor* doth aſſure me that the King's Letter was thus directed: To our Truſty and Well-beloved, the Vice-Chancellor of our Univerſity of *Cambridg*, to be communicated to the *Senate* there.

So that it appears to me it is the common Appellation given to them (as that of Convocation elſe-where) altho theſe Men are ſo ignorant as not to know it, or ſo malicious againſt the *Doctor*, as not to allow it him. It therefore gives cauſe of doubting, whether either of them ever ſaw (in a true and proper ſenſe) the inſide of any Univerſity in their Lives.

Here

Here follows Mr. *Bowes*'s Letter, wherein he hath vindicated himself from Mr. *Chandler*'s unjust and scandalous Reflections.

From *Stubinton*, *Sept.* 29th, 1699.

Much honoured and beloved Brother Russel, *to whom Grace, Mercy and Peace be multiplied, through our Lord Jesus Christ.*

THese Lines come from your Brother in the Faith of our Lord Jesus, *Thomas Bowes*, and are to inform you of the horrid Falsities that are inserted in Mr. *Chandler*'s pretended Narrative, which he would fain have the World believe is impartial, tho indeed it is no such thing: which I hope will evidently appear to all Men who are not prejudiced, especially when the falseness of what he hath writ concerning me and others is made manifest.

For if he will adventure so grosly to belie his Neighbours, who can disprove him, and have opposed him to his face; no wonder if he belie the Dispute it self, and the Disputants, rather than hazard his own Interest, which seemeth to lie at stake.

I shall now give you an account of those things in particular concerning me, which may be found in his Book, that are most notoriously false. And take them as followeth, *viz.*

In his Introduction near the latter end, he is bold to assert, That I and my Party did suspend from our Communion one *Isaac Harman* a Joyner, for hearing Mr. *Webber*, which is horridly false: For there was never any such thing acted by me and my Party in this World towards that young Man, nor any other Person, for going to hear Mr. *Webber*.

This

This Man hath but little regard to Truth it ſelf, that he can boldly charge this notorious Falſhood upon me and my Party, without being able to produce his Author for it, when it was required of him. He hath indeed confidently aſſerted, that the young Man told him ſo himſelf. But the truth of this is like ſome of the reſt of his impartial Narrative.

For the young Man went himſelf, with one of our Friends with him, to the Meeting where Mr. *Chandler* had been preaching, and there charged him with the falſneſs of what he had written, to his face before many of his Hearers; and did then offer to atteſt upon Oath, that he never had one word of Diſcourſe with him in all his life time, neither about that nor any thing elſe.

And Mr. *Chandler* did confeſs before thoſe then preſent, that he could not ſay he had.

Yet ſo unchriſtian-like was their Carriage to him, that at his firſt appearance Mr. *Williams*, the Presbyterian Miniſter, bawl'd out, and ſaid, Where is this Man that fears neither God nor Devil?

To whom the young Man replied, that he had a Soul to be ſaved as well as Mr. *Williams*, and did fear God as well as himſelf.

But that well qualified Man Mr. *Chandler*, did in his fury lay hands on him in ſuch ſort, that his own Hearers cry'd out, Pray Mr. *Chandler* do not ſtrike him.

But alas! this great flood of Heat was ſoon turn'd into the cold ebb of Diſſimulation, when they ſaw that way of ſtirring made them ſtink.

For the next Evening Mr. *Williams* ſent one of his Hearers to *Iſaac Harman*, and deſired him that he would come to his Houſe, and have ſome talk with him in a moderate way; and did acknowledg he was ſorry that he ſhould carry himſelf in ſuch a

paſſionate

passionate way to him the night before.

To this the young Man complied, and went to his House, where Mr. *Williams* treated him with many hollow Compliments. Now it was, Mr. *Harman:* But the night before he cried out, that he neither feared God nor Devil.

But when he saw he could not obtain his end by Flattery, he told the young Man he would have him put into the *Post-Boy*.

But I wonder Mr. *Chandler* should be so forward to ride Post, since the baseness of his Horse, and his own Infirmities have so often brought him to the ground.

But again, in his Introduction he is pleased to charge me with no less than four more as great Lies as is possible for any Man to pen. For,

1. He asserteth, that I applied my self to Mr. *Ring* for a sight of those Sermons which he had writ; which is utterly false.

2. He is bold to say that I read them, which is a horrid Falshood; for I never read them in all my life time.

3. He saith, I having read them, spake words to this effect, *viz.* That if we suffer Mr. *Chandler* thus to go on, it will prejudice our Cause.

But this is as false as any of the rest: For I never spake those words to Mr. *Ring*, no, nor to that effect; which Mr. *Ring* must witness, if he be not biass'd, and will but speak the Truth: But if he will not, they that were with me at that time will justify that I spake no such words, nor to that effect. And it is as false that Mr. *Ring* replied, Mr. *Chandler* takes but the same liberty in his own Congregation that we do in ours; for he never replied so to me. But (perhaps) Mr. *Ring* will give him leave to bely him and the Truth it self, rather than by opposing him hazard his

his own Intereſt, and the loſs of a Place at his Lecture. But I ſhall not give him leave ſo to bely me, tho indeed he hath the Confidence to take it.

4. And laſtly; (tho indeed theſe are not all the Lies he is guilty of concerning me; yet, I hope, it will be the laſt time he will venture ſo groſly to abuſe me, and ſo greatly to ſin againſt God) Mr. *Chandler* doth alſo tell the World, that I was a Man diſſatisfied, and went over to *Goſport* to Mr. *Webber*, which is a notorious Lie; for I never went to Mr. *Webber*, nor ever ſent to him about the Diſputation firſt nor laſt: Yet this Man would have the World believe that what he hath written is Truth, and ſo deceive himſelf and them too (in the end) that hearken to him: For nothing can be more falſe concerning me, than what he hath writ for Truth; and therefore I ſhall charge thoſe Lies upon Mr. *Chandler* as ſome of his own inventing, till he doth produce his Authors, which (I believe) is as hard to bring forth, as the young Man that told him he was ſuſpended, and asked his Advice about it; for as yet he is inviſible.

And I cannot imagine where he will find Authors for ſuch Forgeries, unleſs he beſpeak them. For I can atteſt upon Oath that all thoſe things are utterly falſe and groundleſs, and therefore ought not to be called Miſtakes unleſs there had been ſomething in them.

Again, he is alſo pleaſed to ſay, that if I could believe the Doctrine of Original Sin, as they believe it, I ſhould think Infants had need of Baptiſm: And, that I wonder'd that the People at *Goſport* ſhould be againſt it.

Now whatever I did ſay, I can ſafely declare that I never ſpake what Mr. *Chandler* hath written: And ſo I told him to his face, and did offer to make my Oath of it.

For,

For if I had said what they have written, I should have wronged my own Conscience, in saying that which I did not then believe, nor do yet believe; but I am sure that he hath wronged himself and me also, in saying and writing that which I did not, nor could not speak.

But alas! any thing that does but drop from the Goose-quill of this Man (tho it be never so false) is good enough to please those that follow him; with whom I leave him till the Judgment Day of the great God, where he and I must give account of all things.

But if he in the mean time hath any thing to object, I am his Neighbour, and shall be ready to make good what I have charged upon him, by more than a single Testimony. Witness my hand,

Thomas Bowes.

Here follows a further Testimony, signed by the principal Brethren of the Church at *Portsmouth*, to prove Mr. *Chandler* a false Accuser in what he hath printed about *Isaac Harman*.

WE whose Names are under-written do testify, That *Isaac Harman* was not suspended from our Communion for hearing Mr. *Webber* preach, nor for any thing else. Witness our hands,

Thomas Bowes,
Isaac Harman,
Edward Fishbourn,
James Goodeve,
William Oakely,
Walter Addis,
George Kelley.

Mr. *William Leddel* of *Gosport*'s Vindication.

Here follows an account of those Mistakes and Falshoods they have presumed to charge Mr. Leddel *with, and his Vindication of himself therefrom.*

SIR,

HAving received your Letter, I can do no other than reply for my self. I was willing to contradict that prophetick Remonstrance of being charged to be a Man of Heat without Light. And should I at first sight have declared my thoughts of their Proceedings, I might (perhaps) have written passionately, considering how they have endeavoured to cloud that which (through Providence) hath so many Evidences to the contrary. I believe Truth will have its time to be made apparent.

I shall not say much as to what past in the Disputation, but rather endeavour to acquit my self from Forgery, which I am charged with, especially with relation to what Mr. *Smith* hath said in his Certificate, or Testimonial, which he hath inserted in the 60*th* Page of Mr. *Chandler*'s, Mr. *Leigh*'s, and Mr. *Robinson*'s impartial Account (as they call it) of the *Portsmouth* Disputation. Blame me not for putting him last who should have been first, because not nominated in the Preliminaries, and Mr. *Leigh* comes in by chance. But as to what Mr. *Smith* hath there declared to the World, some of it was then said, but not in that form, nor at all to that purpose, except that Clause wherein he now lets the World know he had an imperfect Account.

For having accidentally met with Mr. *Smith* at his own Habitation, he was pleased to thank me for putting

ting his Name in print, which I then took as an Ironical Speech. I then discovered to him the place where the words were spoken, but could not perfectly remember the day of the Month; whereupon he concluded, that if I did, he had forgotten it; but I hope his forgetfulness is not Argument sufficient to prove I did not. And this I can say, that altho there was but one time that I so directly desired the sight of his Copy to compare it with that I had, yet both before and after I desired the sight of his; and at that time I told him the reason thereof, which he also in his Certificate or Testimonial denies: Yet altho he hath forgotten the other times wherein I desired him to let me see his Copy, or see it when it was done, this does not prove it a Lie, or that he was never spoken to about it: For if it had been so, what cause was there for that needless Excuse of Mr. *Leigh*, that it not being transcribed was not fit to be compar'd, because I might take advantage therefrom; and that such things ought not to be communicated to an Enemy? As if it could not be compared with the Copy that I had, nor to such a Person whom they knew was adverse, and would improve what was there related to their advantage.

I must ingenuously confess I did not tell him it would be printed; but I then told him, I knew not but it would be printed, tho I was not then positive my self. Now if Mr. *Smith* would but recollect his Memory, he might call to mind that I spoke oftner to him than that time in his Shop. It's true, that about two or three days after the Disputation I was willing (for Peace sake) the whole should have been buried.

But to return to Mr. *Smith*, I cannot but wonder what should protect him in giving the World that account of the *Anabaptists* loose and shuffling way of arguing, which gave such Interruption to the bet-

ter taking of what paſt in the Diſpute.

I cannot but retort this upon him; the *Anabaptiſts* (ſo called) might have had as civil Treament among Heathens.

But that Mr. *Smith* ſhould inſinuate that he retorted this to me, and received no Anſwer, it muſt be ſuppoſed I was not ſo hot a Man as their learned Rabbins have reported me to be. But I cannot find fault if I have no Light: And ſince they have all the Light, there can be none left for me. Their Opponents are alſo accounted by them Blockheads and Dunces, as they then gave out, and have upon occaſion ſtill aſſerted. I am not willing to bring Names into queſtion, only I can't but reflect upon thoſe great Trophies of Art, and profound Academics, which were the great Maintainers of that unſcriptural, not to ſay antiſcriptural Notion of Infant-Baptiſm: altho I might, ſeeing their elevated Profundity hath not ſo much as taught them good Manners; calling (at leaſt) their fellow-Creatures, if not their Equals in all good Science, Fools, Blockheads, Liars, and Sophiſters. How incongruous theſe Titles are, tho they had been never ſuch learned Academicks, may appear to thoſe who have but only common ſenſe.

They ſeem agreed to carry on their contracted Conſpiracy, tho it be againſt the Declaration of Heaven. But further, Pray, worthy Sir, muſt your Forgetfulneſs be charged as my Lie? Why may not you be under a miſtake in this, as well as you are in that Clauſe of your Certificate, where you pretend the Imperfection of the Account was occaſioned by the *Anabaptiſts* looſe and ſhuffling way of arguing? For don't you know, when brought to the Teſt your Party could not be kept within bounds? Nay hath it not been defended by the Paſtor you ſit under, (Mr. *John Earl* by name) that we deſerv'd no bette

better Treatment at your hands; and yet lay we occasioned the obstruction of an intelligible Account to the World? Pray, Sir, the next time you get one to abet your Cause, be so kind as to instruct him better in what you would have him say. For *W. Wallen* to attest he was present when I came to you, and yet not know any more what passed then, is strange; or, if he did, why was he no fuller in his Relation?

As to what he says that relates to the time of transcribing your Copy, as it's little to the purpose, so it looks as if he had been your minute Companion, and had known I had never spoken to you but once. And notwithstanding his Attestation, I remember that you told me, that tho it were not done, yet you had begun it, and should make an end of transcribing it in a little time; yet never was so kind to let me see it, till it was calculated to your own Meridian.

But among other things, I wonder you should be so unhappy, as to discover your own weakness to the World, in upbraiding others of Fallaciousness, and yet could not keep your self clear. For to pretend you had compared this with Mr. *Maltby*'s and your own, which you call Originals, and that you found it exactly agreable thereto; and that the one should not stoop lower, nor the other be raised higher; I can't but fear you have conspired together in a Lie: And have not only endeavour'd to insinuate it to be a Truth among your own Friends, but also to the Universe; for it seems to me no less than a Miracle. But what shall I say, when Men care not what they say, nor whereof they affirm; since 'tis well known that Mr. *Smith* knows little of the Greek, if any, and less of the Hebrew, whatever Mr. *Maltby* does: and that your Copy should so exactly agree to a tittle both with Mr. *Maltby*'s, and what is printed, I must leave the World to judg.

But since nothing can be taken for granted but what we have Time, and Place, and Witness to: It will teach me for the future to take a Witness when I shall have occasion to treat with Mr. *Smith*, or any other of them upon such occasions. For as to the proof of this, it depends upon my Yea, and his Nay; I not thinking in the least this would have been so material, as to have given them such an occasion to ground their Cause upon, which was so lamely defended. This seems to be but like a Man that is in danger of being drowned, who will catch at a Feather, which when caught can give him no support. Upon what I have remark'd, there is reason enough undoubtedly to shew, that Mr. *Smith*'s Certificate (by which he would convince the World) is fallacious.

And as to what Mr. *Chandler*, Mr. *Leigh*, and Mr. *Robinson* speak about this matter, neither the annexed Testimonial, nor yet what is in the second side of Dr. *Russel*'s Dedication, saith any such thing; but saith, tho it was desired, could not be obtained. And I *William Leddell* do here attest that it was compared with another Copy, whose it was is yet unknown to me to this day, but was acknowledged by Mr. *Leigh* as before: And that acknowledgment does not want Witness, Mr. *James Goodeve* being present at the delivery of a Letter sent to Mr. *Leigh* by Mr. *Walter Addis*. Now what occasion there should be for a Concealment, tho in the Character it was written, besides the reason alledg'd by Mr. *Leigh*, I know not.

Sir, I think it not meet to animadvert upon all their Reflections and opprobrious Speeches with reference to my self, I not being academically learned; but I desire to learn more of Christ, and to concern my self less with those Persons who are in a Sphere too high for me, that count themselves great, and all others Shrubs, because they have not attained to a

 like

like Stature in human Literature. And let this pass as my Reply to what they have said in reference to me, not being in so great a Heat but a little Water may cool it, provided it be not foul.

William Leddell.

But, Sir, since I thought I had done, casting my Eye upon the third Page of Mr. *Chandler*'s Introduction, I saw as absurd a Passage under my Name as any passed in the whole Book, contrary to an Account that I gave him my self touching *Matthew Caffin:* Altho then Mr. *Chandler*'s business was (as he pretended) to know the Truth, that he might not err in what he was going about, with reference to *Matthew Caffin*'s lying under such a Report of denying the Humanity and Divinity of Christ. But I having no Light, and Mr. *Chandler* having such Eyes as to see where none is; he is, for ought I perceive, creating Light out of Darkness. For he saith, *that I and some others, Men of Heat without Light, were very urgent to accept of* Matthew Caffin *for their Champion.* For I give this as my Testimony, That I my self ever refused *Matthew Caffin* to have any hand in it.

But what Spirit actuates Mr. *Chandler* I know not, that he should not care what he saith.

And when I see so many Untruths couch'd in one Paragraph of his Introduction, it's a plain Indication of those many that follow, for there they are crowded in heaps. But if Mr. *Chandler* had told me who were my Companions, we might then have gon to *Isaac Harman*, whom he recites (tho falsly) to have led us to him, to have borrowed some Light from him, as he (falsly) says *Isaac Harman* did. Now, Sir, pray

be so kind to your self, as to conceal your Paths (for they are dark ones) and let not blind Men tread on your Heels. I hope you will be more careful for the future, and not let Men with no Light (tho as yet you have found but one of them) see into the very Crannies of your wilful and woful Mistakes.

As to the truth of my refusing *Matthew Caffin*, I could bring many Witnesses: And I never knew but one Person who was for him, which Mr. *Chandler* hath happily mist, and is never like to know for me. This is all at present from your Brother in Christ,

William Leddell.

Here follows an account of some of those Falshoods they charge upon Dr. Russel, *in their pretended Impartial Account of the* Portsmouth *Disputation, and his Answers thereunto.*

Brother *Sharp*,

FOrasmuch as you have taken in hand so good a Work, as to vindicate the Truth of that Narrative I supervised and published concerning that Disputation at *Portsmouth*, wherein our well-beloved Brother *Williams* and your self were also engag'd; I thought meet to send you this following Account, to free my self from those Calumnies, the Publishers of that false and abusive Account of that Disputation have undeservedly cast upon me.

1. In *Pag.* 57. they say that I mention'd *Constantine* the Great as a Scripture Instance.

I answer; This they know to be false: For at the same time I refer'd them to the History of the first five

five hundred years, and alledged it only to prove matter of Fact from the Teſtimony of the Fathers; which Mr. *Leigh* accordingly underſtood, or elſe what made him give this Anſwer, What do you tell us of the Fathers? we are not bound to abide by their Teſtimony. See *p.* 35. of my True Narrative.

2. In *Pag.* 61. they ſay, it's falſe that Mr. *Chandler*'s Sermons were the occaſion of the Diſpute, and much more that this is agreed to by them.

To this I anſwer: I have no more to do than to confute them by their own Pens.

My words are theſe. It is agreed on both ſides that Mr. *Chandler*'s Sermons were the occaſion of that Offence taken by you (ſpeaking to Mr. *Bowes*, Mr. *Webber*, and the Churches to whom they belong) and of the Diſpute it ſelf, as appears by the Preliminaries, *&c.*

Now that this is true, appears from their own Pens. For in the Title Page of their own Account they have theſe words: *An Abridgment of thoſe Diſcourſes that were the innocent occaſion of that Diſputation.*

And in *Pag.* 2. *An Abridgment of thoſe Sermons that were the innocent occaſion of the Diſputation.* Now in both theſe places they confeſs what I ſay to be true. For I only ſay they were the occaſion thereof, without ſo much as telling them whether it were an innocent or nocent occaſion.

But, 2. I can prove it under the hands of Mr. *Chandler* and Mr. *Williams* of *Portſmouth*: And for that I refer you to the Preliminaries themſelves, which were read publickly before all the People, and aſſented to by both ſides, as you have them truly printed in my Narrative, *pag.* 3, 4. but omitted in theirs, which begins thus.

Whereas by Mr. *Chandler*'s late preaching on the Ordinance of Baptiſm, ſeveral Perſons have taken offence;

fence; and upon desire of Satisfaction, it's mutually agreed between us whose Names are underwritten, that these two Points be amicably disputed in the following order, *&c.*

Samuel Chandler,
Francis Williams.

I had that very Paper delivered to me in Mr. *Williams*'s Meeting-house at the time of the Dispute, which they signed with their own hands, and have it still by me to witness against them.

And strange it is, that these Men should have the confidence to deny what is so solemnly delivered under their own hands. But perhaps they thought I had lost that Paper, and should not have been able to detect their false Accusation any other way. And this seems to be the true cause why they were so unjust as to omit putting down the Preliminaries in their printed Account, that they might not confute themselves under their own hands.

3. In the same *page* 61. they say it's false that Mr. *Robinson* should in the midst of the Dispute give me the Lie.

1. Pray observe: This is a falsifying of my words, which are these. He said in the midst of the Dispute with a loud Voice, *That is a Lie.* But I did not tell them he said so to me: And under this subterfuge they might suppose to shelter themselves in their Denial. But,

2. I do know that he did say as I have printed it: And if my word may not pass for it, I have divers to testify for me.

Mr. *Webber*, Pastor of the Church at *Gosport*, being with me in *London*, *Sept.* 6. last past, I asked him about it, and he affirms it to be true, that Mr. *Robinson* did give me the Lie, and that there were Witnesses

neſſes enough could teſtify that; for he being mounted in the Pulpit at a diſtance from the reſt of his Brethren, there could be no miſtake about it. See the Truth of this well atteſted in Mr. *Sharp*'s Account.

3. They confeſs that Mr. *Leigh* did give the Lie.

Now I did not accuſe him, but Mr. *Robinſon* only; and (I hope) Mr. *Leigh*'s confeſſing that he gave the Lie, doth not prove that Mr. *Robinſon* did not: But it doth prove that they were a couple of ill-bred, unmannerly Presbyters, to ſay no worſe of them.

4. I muſt now charge them with a notorious Falſhood which they have printed againſt me, in theſe words.

This bold Gentleman hath publiſhed amongſt and by his Friends in *London*; Dr. *Ruſſel* to put it out of doubt, that he and his Friends had carried the day at *Portſmouth*, added, the Biſhop of *Salisbury* had received a Letter from Colonel *Gibſon*, wherein he applauded their, *i. e.* the *Anabaptiſts* Performance.

To this I anſwer.

1. That I never heard of any Letter at all ſent to that Biſhop by Colonel *Gibſon*, till I read it in their printed Account.

2. I never ſaid ſo to any Perſon whatſoever: and I challenge them to produce their Evidence, for till then it muſt be charged upon themſelves.

3. I neither knew nor thought that Colonel *Gibſon* had been ſuch a Zealot for their Cauſe, to trouble himſelf to ſend Letters to two Biſhops (as they ſay he did) in favour of them, till I read it in their printed Account; whereas, had he not been extremely biaſs'd, he might have known better than to have ſent up ſuch an Advertiſment as they ſay he did to put into the *Poſt-man*.

But Mr. *Robinſon* confeſſes that he was the Informer, who waited on the Biſhop to tell him this falſe and malicious Story. And

And whereas he saith, that his Lordship generously allowed them to make use of his Name for the undeceiving the World in this matter: And whereas it plainly appears it was to deceive the World, I hope his Lordship will for the future have a care how he gives Credit to one that hath thus imposed upon him in such a confident manner, with such a notorious invented Story of his own making; and by that means give occasion to have his Name printed, in their false and scandalous Account.

4. This may well give his Lordship (and all others) a just occasion to suspect the Narrative they have published; for if they can allow themselves such a liberty to print such notorious Falshoods as these are about matter of Fact, what reason is there to believe them in any thing they say? And if Mr. *Robinson* will but be so just, as to present his Lordship with my True Narrative; upon comparing both together with our Vindication, I doubt not but he will have other sentiments of that Disputation, and be sufficiently convinc'd of their Partiality and Prevarications.

5. They charge me for abusing Mr. *Gosnold* in these words: 'Tis as ridiculous as to abuse his dear Friend, and prefix false Greek as a Title to his Book; when at least in that Edition we have seen, there is only a plain English Title, *Of the Doctrine of Baptisms.*

1. 'Tis they that abuse me: For the very first words in his Title are, Βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς, in that Edition published by himself. If others that reprinted it since his death have left it out, 'tis their fault, not mine.

2. It's true and proper Greek, as they themselves confess, unless the Apostle *Paul* wrote false Greek; for they say the Letters are the same *Heb.* 6. 2. so that they must not charge Mr. *Gosnold* with it, but the

the Apostle *Paul*. Are not these bold Men, to charge *Paul* with writing false Greek?

3. Their Pretence is false: For that learned Man Mr. *John Gosnold* did know how to distinguish between the Nominative and Genitive Case, and so do I. But they must throw this Reflection upon our Translators of the Bible, and upon *Paul* himself, or rather take it to themselves as a false Accusation, to whom it properly belongs.

4. Mr. *Gosnold* doth not treat of the Baptism of Water alone, but of all the three Baptisms spoken of in Scripture, *viz.* that of Water, (which is a real Baptism) and that of the Spirit, and also that of Affliction, as metaphorical Baptisms. And as the Greek is true, so the Title of his Book is the most proper that could be thought of, *The Doctrine of Baptisms.*

5. As to that for which this Charge is brought, they pretend they gave the Answer there recited in the time of the Dispute; whereas they know 'tis an invented Answer of their own, made on purpose to sham off the matter to which it relates. But that is a small thing with them, for they have done so throughout their pretended Account of the Disputation; wherein they have most egregiously abused the World.

6. In *pag.* 75. they let us know their Memories are short with respect to what I set down in *pag.* 35. of my Narrative, where I say, I do not remember that there is any account in History, during the first five hundred years, that any one of the Fathers, or eminent Bishops of the Church, that were born of Christian Parents, were baptized until they were about twenty or thirty years of Age: And if any of you know the contrary, I desire you would shew it.

Upon which Mr. *Leigh* answered, *What do you tell us of the Fathers? We are not bound to abide by their*

their Teſtimony. And notwithſtanding I then made a full Reply thereto, yet theſe Men tell the World, they do not remember that it was mentioned in the Diſputation.

But the thing they could not remember was, to find out an Inſtance to the contrary: for that they have not given us, neither then nor ſince, which they would certainly have done if they had known how.

But they pretend to remember that which was never ſaid nor thought by me, *viz.* That for the firſt ſix hundred years Infants were admitted to Communion in the Lord's-Supper. And this I muſt charge upon them as utterly falſe, and an Invention of their own.

But it is true, that from *Auſtin*'s time for the ſpace of five or ſix hundred years the Supper was given to Infants; and both that and Baptiſm contended for as neceſſary to Salvation: For which *Auſtin* had that Name given him of *Pater durus Infantium.* And this is ſo well known to the Learned, that theſe Men will but diſcover their Ignorance in denying it.

7. They have wholly altered the ſtate of the Caſe, as to what Mr. *Chandler* ſaid upon *Dan.* 4. 33. For whereas he aſſerted that the word in the Septuagint Tranſlation was *baptizo*; I denied it, and told him it was *ebaphe:* But that if it had been as he ſaid, it was nothing to his purpoſe, becauſe it was not originally written in Greek.

Upon which he ſaid, *Baptizo* comes from *Tabal.* I asked him then, how it was in the Hebrew in that place? He anſwered it was *Tabal:* which I denied.

And after I had ſeen the place, I told him it was not there. See *p.* 54. of my Narrative. And at laſt Mr. *Chandler* confeſt it was not. And they all allow it in Print.

Nevertheleſs in their own account, *p.* 82. they ſay, that

that to try my Skill in the Hebrew, who had so shamefully faulter'd in the Greek, I was asked what the Hebrew word was, and that I said, if I had an Hebrew Bible I could tell.

Now this I must charge upon them as an Invention of their own: And his Friend Mr. *Ring* can testify that I had made my Observations upon that place in *Dan.* 4. 33. and sent them to *Portsmouth* in a Letter, and received an Answer from him before I came down to the Dispute; and had examined the place upon the occasion of a Passage upon it in Mr. *Chandler's* Sermon, upon the word *Tabal*, and therefore knew what Mr. *Chandler* said was false before I came from *London*: So that I did not stand in need of a Hebrew Bible to examine that in the time of the Dispute. But I have cause to suspect that Mr. *Chandler* had not examined it himself, but made use of some other, who did not rightly inform him: for altho it be in *v.* 33. in the English Bible, it is not so in the Hebrew, but in *v.* 30. And altho I knew it, I was no more obliged to teach him that, than I was to instruct him in the difference between the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* words in the Book of *Daniel*. But it was my business to force him to acknowledg before all the People, that what he said was false; which accordingly he did, and hath since done in Print.

And as for that silly Sarcasm of theirs, that Hebrew Bibles are all misplaced with him; for we hear from good hands (they should have said from lying hands) that at *Havering* in *Essex*, he was confounded with the same place, and could not find the Prophecy of *Daniel*.

I answer; First, I had but one Dispute at *Essex*, and that was in the Parish-Church at *Avely*, with Mr. *Pomfret* and Mr. *Taylor*; and there was no mention made of this place in *Daniel*, either by them or me.

2. There

2. There was no Hebrew Bible produced, nor was there any occasion for it: So that I must return this Story to the Father of Lies, from whence it came.

And that the World may see that what I say is true, I shall insert the following Certificate, written by Persons of known Integrity and Ability, who were present at that Dispute; which was obtained by your self, and sign'd in your presence.

WE whose Names are under-written do testify, That at the Dispute at *Avely* in *Essex*, between Dr. *William Russel* and Mr. *Samuel Pomfret*, concerning the baptizing of Infants, there was not any mention made of Hebrew Words, nor any Hebrew Bible spoke of, nor produced, for there was not any occasion for it, their Dispute being more about the Subjects than the Manner. Witness our Hands,

Octob. 13. 1699.

John Lowke,
Joseph Jackson,
Cornelius Denne.

There are several other things that deserve to be remarked, but because they will occur in my Observations upon the Dispute it self, and their Reflections upon it, I shall take notice of them as they occasionally present themselves in my following Observations.

Some

Some OBSERVATIONS upon their DEDICATION.

By Dr. *WILLIAM RUSSEL.*

THey dedicate their ſcandalous Pamphlet to the Honourable Major General *Earl*, Governor; Colonel *John Gibſon*, Lieutenant-Governor of his Majeſty's Gariſon of *Portſmouth*; and the worſhipful *Henry Seager* Eſq; Mayor of *Portſmouth*.

1ſt. Theſe Men quarrel with me for calling Colonel *Gibſon* Deputy-Governor, when themſelves acknowledg that Major-General *Earl* is Governor. Is not Deputy-Governor as honourable a Title as Lieutenant?

If they think I ſpeak too diminutively of him, can they ſuppoſe they have mended the matter in preſuming to yoke their Worſhipful Eſq; *Henry Seager*, who drives that common Trade of a Baker in the Town of *Portſmouth*, with ſuch honourable Perſons as the other two? Is this all the Reſpect and Honour they can afford to give them?

2dly. They ſay, We humbly lay theſe Papers at your feet. Surely they have reaſon to trample upon them in diſdain, when they find themſelves intituled to ſuch a falſe and ſcandalous Pamphlet.

3dly. They ſay, who procured for us a Grant from his Majeſty, publickly to vindicate the common Cauſe of the Reformed Churches.

1. Infant-ſprinkling is the thing you muſt intend. How then came you to decline the Vindication thereof, and refuſe to give ſo much as one ſingle inſtance

for your Practice, altho you were often call'd upon to do it (in the time of the Disputation) both by Mr. *John Williams* and my self?

2. How comes Infant-sprinkling to be appropriated (by you) to the Reformed Churches? Surely there are others in the World practise that, besides those of the Reformed Churches.

Are you so ignorant, as not to know that all the Papists in *France*, *Spain*, *Portugal*, *Germany*, *Poland*, *Italy*, and *Rome* it self (the Seat of the Whore of *Babylon*) do practise Infant-sprinkling as well as you? How then have you the confidence to tell these Honorable Persons, and the whole World, it is the common Cause of the Reformed Churches? whereas it is notoriously known, that it is the common Cause both of Papists and those you call Reformed.

3. If it be appropriated peculiarly to either, it must be to the Church of *Rome*; for you know that the Reformed Churches did receive it from her, and have retain'd it as one of her Relicks to this day. For they have no Scripture Authority for it.

4thly. They say it tends very much to the advancement of early Piety and Religion.

1. If they believe themselves, why were they guilty of so great a Sin of Omission, as not to vindicate their Practice when they were so often prest to it, and yet could not be prevailed upon to give any Scripture Instance for it: And would not so much as try their Skill (when so fair an opportunity was put into their hands) to prove their own Practice, and thereby settle those that are wavering among them; notwithstanding they pretend it was the thing for which those Honourable Persons procured for them a Grant from his Majesty?

But, 2. How the sprinkling a little Water upon the Infants Faces, and calling that Baptism, should be to

them

them an occasion of early Piety and Religion, is sooner said than proved.

It seems to me rather to have a contrary tendency, especially your telling them when they come to years of understanding, that by their Baptism they are put into a new Covenant-relation, that you have dedicated them to God, that they are in a state of Salvation; that those who neglect it, have no more reason to hope for the Salvation of their Infants than the Heathens; but they must only leave them to the unfathomable depths of God's Goodness, having no Promise to rely upon, *p.* 11. That they are solemnly admitted by Baptism into the Visible Church; (how this agrees with Mr. *Leigh*'s Argument from *Mat.* 19. he would do well to consider) that they are the more special Objects of the Promises of Grace; that the Vein of Election frequently runs in the Channel of believing Parents, and their Seed; and that if they die during their Infant-state, they shall be saved, *pag.* 8.

Add to this what is said in their Preface, that the Covenant of Grace does fix the Terms upon which Christ will be a Saviour to any; that thence *only* it is to be known whom he will save, and whom he will not.

Now unless these Men will deny the Doctrine of final Perseverance (as held by the Calvinists) they do rather give those Children an occasion from hence to neglect the most important Duties of the Gospel.

For, why should they repent and be baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of their Sins, if they are baptized already, and their Sins all pardoned, and this Pardon sealed to them by sprinkling a little Water on their faces?

Why should they believe in Christ, that through him they might have an Interest in eternal Life and Glory, if it be secured to them already another way?

Why ſhould they work out their own Salvation with fear and trembling, if it be ſecured and ſealed to them already, by what you call Baptiſm, without any poſſibility of miſcarrying? For they ſay, that if ſuch die in their Infancy, they ſhall be ſaved.

Now, Do they not hereby do all that in them lies to perſwade ſuch Perſons, that if they had died in their Infant-ſtate, they ſhould have been ſaved by being in the Covenant of Grace, and in the Line of Election? And can they (after all this) ſin themſelves out again, and become Reprobates? I thought you Presbyters had been of another mind. Can you put them (whilſt Infants) into the Covenant of Grace, and turn them out again (when they come to be Adult) as you think fit? I cannot imagine you do believe your ſelves when you thus write; nor can you ever think to gain us to your Party by ſuch Inconſiſtences as theſe: For we know that the Decrees of God are immutable, and it is not in the power of any Creature to alter them. And we alſo know, that you cannot (from your own Principles) be at any certainty who are elected, and who are not (whilſt in an Infant-ſtate) till ſuch time as they come to be effectually called. And ſeeing you do not believe that all Infants dying in their Infant-ſtate ſhall be ſaved; becauſe you tell us, that you leave ſuch as die unbaptized to the unfathomable depths of God's Goodneſs, there being no Promiſe to rely upon: I muſt now needs diſcern the cloven Foot, notwithſtanding your ſham pretences to cover it: For unleſs you did think that the ſprinkling of Infants is neceſſary to Salvation (notwithſtanding thoſe deceitful Expreſſions in your Preface) or (at leaſt) did doubt within your ſelves, whether any unbaptized Infant could be ſaved, all this you talk of is but inſignificant trifling. And you had better deal plainly with the World (as one of your

your Brethren did) to let them know, that if he must baptize no Infants but what he knew to be of the number of the Elect, he must not baptize any; for he did not know what Infants were in the Covenant of Grace, and in the Line of Election, and what were not: For, I believe you know as little of the matter as he, altho you seem so unwilling to confess it. But if you neither baptize them, as knowing them to be the Elect of God, nor yet in the Covenant of Grace, how can you say they are in a state of Salvation, and that if they die in their Infancy they shall be saved; except you did conclude (as *Austin* did) that the Baptism of Infants is necessary to Salvation, and that they are actually brought into the Line of Election thereby, and made the Children of God, and Heirs of Glory? And if so, then free your selves from the Papists *Opus operatum*, if you know how. Is this the way to early Piety? Surely no.

For if they were not sprinkled in their Infancy, and afterwards told by you (or others) that it was a sufficient Baptism (altho in truth it is no Baptism at all) they might then be easily prevailed upon to submit to the Baptism of Christ. And when they are taught that Repentance from dead Works, and Faith towards God were to precede Baptism, and to fit them for it: And that Baptism is an initiating Ordinance, without which they cannot be true Members of the visible Church of Christ: And that they must be dead to Sin, before they were buried with Christ by Baptism: And that after they were baptized, they must walk in newness of Life. This were a more probable way to incline them to that great Duty of remembring their Creator in the days of their youth; and to promote and advance early Piety and true Religion in their Hearts and Lives.

But so long as you shall tell them that they are

made Disciples of Christ as soon as they are born; that they were made Christians, Members of the Church, and enter'd into the new Covenant by what you did for them when you sprinkled them with Water: This hath a direct tendency to lull them asleep in security, and make them draw this false Conclusion, that they were thereby made Christians indeed, and so deceive their own Souls.

For, it is found by woful Experience, that many of them who are poor, ignorant, impenitent, and wretched Sinners; yet they will be exceeding angry if you do but question their being (really and indeed) Christians. What (say they) were not we baptized in our Infancy, and thereby made Christians, Members of Christ, Children of God, and Heirs of the Kingdom; and do you question our Christianity? Now if you will but seriously consider how far you have been the unhappy Instruments of the ruin of these poor Creatures, by hardning them against the Truth, as it is in Jesus; and making them (like the Pharisees and Lawyers of old) reject the Counsel of God against themselves by that deception you have put upon their Understandings, you would certainly discern that you have made work for Repentance, and cannot acquit your selves therefrom, until you do renounce that scriptureless Practice of Infant-sprinkling, and submit to that holy Ordinance of Believers Baptism, as appointed by Jesus Christ, and provoke others thereunto.

5*thly*. But further, in their Dedication they appeal to the honourable Governor, and to the worshipful Baker, as to disinterested Persons, and proper Judges.

As for *Henry Seager* the Baker, he is no disinterested Person, unless this proves him to be such, because when he was Mayor, he carried the Mace to the Presbyterian Meeting, and hath gone to it both before and

and since the Dispute, and been a Benefactor to them for several years, as is certified from thence.

Now I can as little suppose him to be a proper Judg, as a disinterested Person; because I am well satisfied he is unskill'd in the Controversy, and incompetent as to Parts and Learning to fit him for it: But being worshipful, he would serve their turn to make a noise with in other Parts where he was not known, to give a faint Colour to a fading Cause.

6*thly*. But the most amazing Passage in it is this, That they should have Confidence to tell the World, that their Account (they give of the Dispute) is true and impartial: That it is what was taken by the Pens of the Scribes, without any material alteration: Whereas they know in their Consciences it is not so, as may be made appear in due place.

7*thly*. And whereas they talk of Disorders in the time of the Dispute; they also know there was nothing of that kind committed by us (notwithstanding their repeated Provocations) but all of it by themselves, and their own Party. Themselves were certainly guilty of great Incivilities in giving the Lie, in their hissing, and making such a noise that we could not be heard: Which was so far from being a sign they were willing that Truth should take place, that it was an evident Demonstration of the direct contrary.

I now come to make some Observations upon the Account they give of the Dispute it self: By which it will appear that it is a false and partial Account.

1. They have left out the Speech I made in the beginning.

2. Given no account of Mr. *Chandler*'s beginning with Prayer.

3. The Preliminaries agreed upon, and read publickly, they have wholly omitted.

4. Mr. *Chandler*'s Apology to the People, which he calls his Prologue, they have alter'd: For I have carefully examin'd Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, and I find it there verbatim as I have put it down in my Narrative. For, 1. He puts Pride before Vanity. 2. Adds Doctrine. 3. Leaves out the New Testament. 4. There is a Transposition and Omission of other words, which I pass by.

5. Mr. *Chandler* hath alter'd the words of the first Question to be disputed. As first, he hath left out *and Saviour*, hath put *only* before *are*. And instead of *And not Infants*, he hath put in these words, *or their Infants also*; which alters the state of the Question. And in the second Question he hath put in *this* instead of *the*, and *wise* instead of *ways*; and it is the more remarkable, because it differs not only from mine, but from that written Copy signed by Mr. *Williams* and himself: So that it must either be a heedless or a wilful Act.

6. The Speech I made upon Mr. *Chandler*'s repeating the Questions, is part of it left out, and the rest alter'd.

7. In what follows they have left out a whole Sentence, and put down words of their own framing; and have wholly omitted what I say about the manner of Disputation.

8. They put down my first Argument by halves, leaving out these words *and Saviour* in the *major*; and have not expressed either the *Subjects* or *Baptism* in the *minor*; and also left out the *Conclusion*. Is this your Impartial Narrative?

9. In his first Answer to this Argument he leaves out *commanded*, and in the room thereof he puts in *expresly, and by name*, which is not in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy.

10. He leaves out my whole Reply to him, which contains nine Lines; and is as pertinent a Reply as any in the Dispute: But I suppose the reason was, be-

cauſe the whole Synod of Presbyters that met to contrive this Account, were not able to anſwer it.

But to hide that from the Reader, he makes a Reply of his own framing, as if then ſpoken by me; which is directly contrary to what Mr. *Ring* hath in his Copy, as ſpoken by me, when Mr. *Chandler* denied my *minor*. So that it muſt be wilful, becauſe they had Mr. *Ring*'s Copy by them: For I ſpoke affirmatively, as Mr. *Ring* truly ſaith, and not negatively, as they ſay.

The words I ſpake, as you may ſee in my Narrative, *pag.* 8. beginning, are theſe. By denying the *minor*, you ſay that Chriſt hath ſome where required ſome of his Miniſters to baptize Infants, which agrees with Mr. *Ring*'s Account.

But the words in their printed Account are theſe. *Ruſſel*, Then you ſuppoſe that Chriſt hath no where required it. What can be more contrary?

11. Mr. *Chandler* is brought in giving a Negative Anſwer, when it was not he, but Mr. *Leigh* that gave the Anſwer; and I have put it down verbatim in my True Narrative, as it is in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, *viz.* Mr. *Leigh*, we diſtinguiſh between conſequential Truths, and expreſs Words; whereas they have brought in Mr. *Chandler* ſaying, No, *&c.* Is this fair dealing? to change both the Perſon and the Words alſo: yet this they have done.

12. They have alſo tranſpoſed and altered much that follows in that Page, and have left out about twenty Lines; particularly that Parallel I made between an Ambaſſador and a Miniſter of Chriſt, with relation to our Lord's great Commiſſion, which they have wholly omitted.

13. They have left out Mr. *Chandler*'s words in anſwer to mine. What, from the Commiſſion? and yet theſe words are in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, altho omitted by them.

14. They

14. They also omit Mr. *Robinson*'s words to Mr. *Chandler*, who cries out, Hold! Dr. *Russel* must prove it by a universal Negative. And this they know is in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy.

15. They also omit my Answer to Mr. *Robinson*, viz. Then Mr. *Chandler* must deny some part of my Argument, which I have not yet been able to prevail with him to do. This also is noted in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, but they take no notice of it.

16. Here again they repeat my Argument partially, leaving out that part of it which should give the common Reader the greatest Light, and best Information about it.

17. Here (I am well satisfied) they abuse the dead: For they bring in old Mr. *Williams*, saying that which is neither in Mr. *Bissel* the Town Clerk's Copy, nor in Mr. *Ring*'s, nor in the old Gentleman's; whereas it's evident, it was long after that before Mr. *John Williams* did engage in the Dispute. The words they note as said by him are these, *any way*.

But why must this be done, and marked with an Asterisk? why this seems to be the Motive, that they might make their Observation upon it (in a Break made on purpose) before the words were, *any where*. A wonderful Observation! But more of this hereafter.

18. They bring me in speaking thus, It's all one to me, so you prove the thing, prove it any way. Upon this they observe in a Break made on purpose (that which is utterly false) *viz. He is attempting to shift the Opponency.*

Where were these Mens Wits when they made this Observation? Pray observe; this was before ever Mr. *Chandler* had so much as fixt upon any direct Answer to my first Argument, as appears by their own printed Account. And in the following words they

they bring him in saying, I deny your *minor*. From whence the Reader may perceive that I was so far from shifting off the Opponency, that I was pressing him with all my might to give his Answer; and that I gave him all the scope he could desire: For I allowed him to do it by Consequence, or any other way, which way he pleased. But you see the Impertinency of these Men, that when I was Opponent, and he Respondent, they must trifle away so much time to know of me how I would allow them to prove Infant-Baptism (according to the stated Question agreed upon on both sides long before) when they should take upon them the Opponency: For till then it was no part of their business, but a mere shuffle to spend time, lest they should (by a universal Negative) be forced to assign an Instance for their Practice from Scripture, which they knew was impossible for them to do.

19. They bring me in saying, I prove it thus, only I would let the People know what you say, *viz.* That Christ hath some where required his Ministers to baptize Infants. Their Note upon it marked with an Asterisk, is this: *Somewhere.* The word is again alter'd from *any way* to *somewhere*. A worthy Observation for a Classis of Presbyters!

But this was not my Answer, but an invented one of their own: For my Answer was this, By denying the *minor*, you say, that Christ hath somewhere required some of his Ministers to baptize Infants. And this I did, that I might give those People to understand what we were then upon, who did not know what was the difference betwixt the *major* and *minor*, and without which they might have been ignorant of what we had intended in our way of arguing.

20. When I called for a plain denial of (any) one part of my Argument, even what part he pleased

(as

(as themſelves word it) their Obſervation in a Break is this, The *Doctor* now ſeems unwilling again to allow Scripture-Conſequence.

This is to abuſe their Reader: For it was not Mr. *Chandler*, but my ſelf, that was Opponent; and therefore there was no room for him to urge Conſequences till it came to his turn.

21. Yet in the next words they bring in Mr. *Leigh* undertaking the Opponency, which they confeſs he ought not to have done. But he only talked of it, but did not do it, for he knew it was a Task too heavy for him, and ſo waved it.

Now there is not one word of all this in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, nor in Mr. *Biſſel*'s, nor in mine: And I am well ſatisfied there was not one word ſpoken by Mr. *Leigh* at that time.

22. Upon Mr. *Chandler*'s denying the *minor* of my univerſal Negative, they have falſified my Anſwer, and made it quite another thing.

For, whereas I ſay to him, Hold, Sir, it is an univerſal Negative, you muſt give your Inſtance, *&c.* which are the words in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy. They bring me in, ſaying, It's an univerſal Negative, you muſt prove it.

Now I did not call upon Mr. *Chandler* to prove my Argument, as they do ſlily and diſingenuouſly inſinuate; but I call'd upon him to give his Inſtance where it was ſo written in holy Scripture, that Chriſt had required any of his Miniſters to baptize Infants; which I then told him (and do ſtill affirm) he ought to have done, otherwiſe we might argue *ad infinitum.* And this Mr. *Leigh* knew right well; and therefore he bids Mr. *Chandler* offer me the Commiſſion for an Inſtance, as themſelves have confeſſed in their printed Account.

But Mr. *Robinſon* (they tell you) oppoſed it: for he

he knew there was no ſuch thing expreſt in the Commiſſion, and did in effect give away the Cauſe of Infant-Baptiſm at once: For his words are theſe, (as recited both in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, and my True Narrative.)

Mr. *Robinſon*, you muſt prove it ſtill. Suppoſe Mr. *Chandler* cannot give an Inſtance, nor no body in the Company, you cannot thence infer that none in the World can.

23. This alſo they have falſified, and ſet down in their printed Account a Fancy of their own invention. They have put in Mr. *Leigh*, who was not then mentioned by Mr. *Robinſon*, and have left out theſe words, nor no body in the Company.

Now they know it was urged upon them all, and deſired that if any one of them could give an Inſtance, they would pleaſe to do it: And yet none of them could be prevailed upon ſo much as to attempt it. Surely the New Teſtament is not ſo large a Volume, but either Mr. *Chandler*, or ſome other of thoſe Miniſters that were preſent (whoſe number was ſaid to be about five and twenty or thirty) might have been ſuppoſed to have read it all over, and to have known where ſuch an Inſtance had been written, in caſe any ſuch thing had been contain'd therein.

What, are they all ſo ignorant of the holy Scriptures, that not one of them can tell what is written in the New Teſtament about holy Baptiſm? How then can they be fit to teach others their Duty concerning it? I muſt therefore once more take the liberty to tell them, that when there were ſo many Men of Parts and Learning together (as there then were) if none of them are able to give us one Inſtance from Scripture for their Practice of Infant-Baptiſm, we cannot expect that any body elſe ſhould.

It's much to me, that inſtead of Mr. *Chandler*'s

old

old Sermons, pick'd out of other Mens Works, they had not tried their Skill to have attempted ſome Inſtance from Scripture for their Practice, ſeeing they ſat brooding upon their Narrative ſo long, as not to ſuffer it to come abroad till more than ſix Months were paſt after the Diſpute. Surely they might have found it out in all that time, if it had been ſo written in the New Teſtament.

If therefore Mr. *Chandler*'s Sermons are eſteemed by them as their *ne plus ultra*, we muſt conclude they have nothing of that kind to produce, and therefore muſt ceaſe for time to come ever to expect it from them.

24. Here they have thruſt in Matter never ſpoken, and tranſpoſed and mangled what was ſpoken, and have formed it according to their pleaſure, without any regard had to Truth or Juſtice. For,

(1.) They have made a Speech for Mr. *Robinſon* that he never ſpake, and another for Mr. *John Williams*, p. 5. And I appeal to Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, for there is not one word of either of them there, nor in any one of the other Copies I ever ſaw.

(2.) They leave out (almoſt) a whole Sentence of mine, and uſe their Art and Skill to deceive the Reader by making a *ſtroke*, as if it were left out by the Scribes: Whereas in that part they recite, they had Mr. *Ring*'s Copy to inform them, and therefore muſt know that they did not put it down right; and ſo have wilfully miſrepreſented me to the World.

Their words are as follows. *Ruſ.* I would have theſe honourable Perſons here preſent to conſider that I am under great Diſadvantage ———— you are to give an Inſtance. What my words are you may ſee in *pag.* 8. of my Narrative at the lower end; they are too long to recite: For my whole Anſwer to Mr. *Robinſon* contains twelve Lines, and theirs

theirs is contained in two Lines and a half. Is this agreable to their Title, *An Impartial Account?*

(3.) Their transposing and altering. For my next words (which agree with Mr. *Ring*'s Account) are these: Mr. *Chandler*, this is only a Trick to turn off the Opponency. Dr. *Russel*, What do you talk of a Trick? I hope you are able to give an Instance of what is your daily Practice.

But instead thereof they put down this false Account. *Rob.* This is your popular Argument to shift the Opponency, and turn it upon the Respondent. 1. Here is a change of Persons, *Rob.* for *Chandler*. 2. They proceed as they began, and make a Speech for me at their own pleasure: And thus they go on till they come to the next Page. This is a Practice they have great cause to be ashamed of, when (at the same time) they pretend to give an Impartial Account.

25. In *pag.* 6. they bring me in, saying, I am sure, according to the Rules of Dispute, Mr. *Chandler* must prove the Negative.

This I must charge as another Falshood upon them: For my words are these; If you say you have no Scripture-Proof for Infants Baptism, I have done. But why must you prevent Mr. *Chandler?* I hope here are some honourable Persons, and others that understand the nature of this Controversy; and they may reasonably expect that those who have made such a noise about it, can give some tolerable Instance for it: And if they will do that, we will proceed to examine it.

It is therefore evident, that here is not any thing like what they report; so that if I charge them with down-right Forgery, they must bear with it, for they knew that my words were according to Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, and that they had abused both him and me.

26. They have again alter'd Mr. *Robinson*'s next Answer,

Anſwer, and framed words for him that were not then ſpoken, as appears by Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, which I have truly recited in my Narrative, to which I refer you.

27. Here they give an invented Anſwer again; *Ruſ.* So I deſign if there be no Anſwer given: whereas my words are (as Mr. *Ring* hath noted) I have proved it, till you give your Inſtance; which they know to be the true ſenſe of what I have put down in my Narrative.

28. *Chand.* Here is an Anſwer, I deny the *minor.* Now hear what Mr. *Ring* ſaith. *Robinſon.* If you will change ſides, Mr. *Chandler*, you may admit this Trick. In this they have both changed the words, and the Perſons ſpeaking.

29. They have alſo invented an Anſwer for me, directly contrary to Mr. *Ring*'s Copy.

30. They have invented a Speech for Mr. *Leigh*, of which there is not one word in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy.

31. Here they have tranſpoſed Mr. *Robinſon*'s words, and left out the one half of them, as they are in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy.

32. Here they have brought me in anſwering Mr. *Robinſon* thus: This is no changing ſides; for I do not deſign to quit the Opponency, only let him bring an Inſtance.

Whereas I have truly repreſented the Anſwer I gave in *p.* 9. of my Narrative, according to Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, where you will find that the Anſwer was given in other words; and not to Mr. *Robinſon*, but to Mr. *Chandler.*

33. But why muſt this be put in here? They tell you, the *Doctor*'s deſign even now was to turn the Opponency on us, as I can prove (ſaith he) from a Letter of Mr. *John Williams*: But now he will not quit the Opponency, and yet expects a Scripture-proof for Infant-Baptiſm.

To

To this I answer.

(1.) That no Man in the World could have known this, if I had so designed, for I never said so: And it's God only that knows the Heart.

(2.) I do now tell all the World (as I then told you) that I had no such design.

(3.) What you say of (the deceased) Mr. *John Williams* is utterly false: For he hath not so written in his Letter to Mr. *Leigh*, altho he hath the confidence to tell the World that he can prove it from Mr. *John Williams*'s Letter. For I have a Copy of his Letter writ by himself, and signed with his own hand, and there are not those words, that I designed to turn the Opponency upon you, as you say. The genuine sense of his words is, to let you know what you might have done to have shewed your Parts in the Vindication of your beloved Practice, if you had given an Instance when I run you upon it by an universal Negative, and said you ought to have done it according to the Rules of Dispute: And that the World may be satisfied herein, both Mr. *John Sharp* and Mr. *Williams* his Sons have caused it to be printed, as containing such things in it as are of use to the Publick with relation to the Disputation.

34. They have introduced Mr. *Leigh* making a formal Speech, of which there is not one word in any of the Copies I have seen. But in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, Mr. *Robinson* is the Speaker, which agrees with my Narrative. But why is this done? The reason seems to be this, 1. To darken the Peoples Understandings, that they might not discern their Fallacy. 2. To throw the Reflection off from themselves, and cast it (as much as they can) upon Dr. *Smith*; for which he hath no reason to thank them. The Question (they say Mr. *Leigh* put) was this: I desire, Sir, you would declare, whether Dr. *Russel* be not obliged

to prove the Negative he hath asserted? Now, as I do not know any thing of it, so there is not one word in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, neither of that nor any thing else that Mr. *Leigh* spake at that time.

But if Mr. *Leigh* had so spoken, there had been as little sense in it as was in Mr. *Robinson*'s words, when he called a Negative an Affirmative. But any thing serves to veil over a bad Cause. For, to set this in a clearer Light, I will give the Reader a view of the first Argument, and shew him how I brought them to that issue upon it: And I might have forbore to have argued with them any longer, unless they had given their Instance.

Arg. 1. If Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants, then the Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

But Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants:

Ergo, The Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Mr. *Chandler*, after divers shifts and evasions about the *major*, says thus, I deny your *minor*. My Answer to him was, By denying the *minor*, you say that Christ hath somewhere required some of his Ministers to baptize Infants. This being by them allowed, I did proceed to make good my *minor* thus.

If Christ hath any where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants, it's somewhere so recorded in the holy Scriptures.

But it's no where so recorded in the holy Scriptures:

Ergo, Christ hath not any where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants.

Upon this (after a Question put, and a Distinction upon it) Mr. *Chandler* said, I deny the *minor*: My

My Answer was, Then you say it's somewhere so recorded in holy Scripture. I therefore argued thus.

If it be any where so recorded in holy Scripture, Mr. *Chandler* or some other Person is able to shew it.

But neither Mr. *Chandler*, nor any other Person whatsoever, is able to shew it:

Ergo, It is not any where so recorded in holy Scripture.

Whereupon Mr. *Chandler* said, I deny your *minor*. Now by denying my *minor*, I appeal to all that understand an Argument, whether in so doing he doth not assert, that he or some other were able to shew where it is recorded in holy Scripture, that Christ hath required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants. And this is to go their own way. But I told him it was an universal Negative, and therefore he must give his Instance where it is so written, but could by no means bring him to it; and the reason was because he had none to give; and till he doth, my Argument will stand good, as I then told him: For otherwise we may argue *ad infinitum*, and never bring any thing to an issue. And I do once more challenge them to produce one single Instance for their Assertion.

After a tedious Discourse upon it, Mr. *Robinson* said, I appeal to any that understand Logick, whether this be sufferable for him thus to turn the Opponency upon Mr. *Chandler?*

Then Dr. *Smith* stood up and said, If I must speak, then by your leave, according to what I always understood, He that asserts must prove.

Whereupon I answer'd, Then they having asserted that Infants are the Subjects of Baptism, they are to prove their Practice, especially when they are forced upon it by an universal Negative: We desire but one single Instance, and they will not assign it.

35. But when they pretend to recite Dr. *Smith*'s

words, they deal as unworthily by him as they had done by me: For they bring him in saying, according to the Rules of Disputation, *Negantis non est probare*; or, *Asserenti incumbit probatio.* He said the one, or the other, they tell you: But they do not so much as pretend he said both. What must the Reader conclude from hence? but that they did not, or would not know what he did say. For by the same Rule they say it was this, or that, and are not certain which it was, it might as well be neither; but only what I have said according to Mr. *Ring*'s Copy. And thus after they have wracked their Brains to evade the force of this Argument, on purpose to shift off the giving an Instance out of holy Scripture for their unscriptural Practice, they have only fulfilled the old Proverb, *Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus.*

For, if he had said, *negantis non est probare*, he that denies is not bound to prove, as they would perswade us he did, what advantage would it have been to them? I was upon the Negative, and had issued my first Argument by a universal Negative, which can never be invalidated without an Instance: Certainly then (according to that) I was not obliged to prove my Denial (but they to give their Instance) for I had proved that before by such Arguments as they were not then, nor yet since have been able by all their Learning to confute.

But themselves are doubtful whether Dr. *Smith* said so, and therefore tell us, if he did not say that, he said, *Asserenti incumbit probatio*, which is the same with what Mr. *Ring*'s Copy saith; He that asserts must prove. But I do not believe he said either of them in Latin (not that I doubt of his ability so to do, for I have heard a good Character of him from a Physician, who said he knew him in the University) for, as I my self know not any such thing, so Mr. *Ring*,

who

who hath several times took notice of the Greek words spoken both by me and them, only sets down Dr. *Smith*'s words in English: And whoever observes my Answer, must needs know that I understood it so, by telling them, that they having asserted Infant-Baptism, ought to prove their Practice, by shewing us where it was so written in the holy Scriptures; we demanding of them but only a single Instance, by which the Controversy would have been at an end. So that they have labour'd in vain, and spent their Strength for nought; leaving the Multitude (as they call them) as wise as they found them, and so they are like to remain (so far as I can perceive) if they expect satisfaction from them. For they that want Light themselves, cannot impart it to others.

36. Here they sham a Forgery upon me, bringing me in saying, Well, what must I do? As if I had been at a loss what to say, and must ask them to direct me; whereas they know in their Consciences, I did not use to be at a loss to answer them, when three or four of them have very uncivilly fallen upon me at once; but it pleased God to keep me in a composed frame of Spirit, and to assist me under it beyond what I could have expected. But suppose I had been at a loss, can the Reader think I would have told them so, and ask'd their Advice what to do? This is as improbable a Story, as Mr. *Chandler*'s lying Invention about *Isaac Harman*, wherein he was disproved to his face before divers of his Hearers. But however, he is unwilling to be brought to confess the Truth, but instead thereof (in their second Edition) seems only to make a weak excuse, by saying a silly Woman told him so; when he had reported the Story in Print as a thing of his own knowledg: And to close his Story, he tells us he shall no more trouble the World with personal matters,

but give *Pilate*'s ſurly Anſwer to all ſuch, *What I have written, I have written.*

But to come to the matter in hand, I know what they have ſaid here to be utterly falſe, and contrary to Mr. *Ring*'s Copy, as they alſo know: But I perceive they are reſolved to ſay any thing, tho never ſo untrue, and againſt their knowledg, to avoid the ſhame (if they could) of being baffled in their Cauſe at the Diſputation.

37. Again, they bring in another invented Story, and make Mr. *Robinſon* to ſpeak what he did not ſpeak, and Dr. *Smith* to be of his mind. I muſt here vindicate Dr. *Smith* again: For, if their own Story (as I have before obſerved) be true, that Mr. *Leigh* ſhould ask him this Queſtion, Whether Dr. *Ruſſel* be not obliged to prove the Negative he hath aſſerted? and he ſhould anſwer as they ſay, *Negantis non eſt probare*, he that denies is not to prove; with what fairneſs could he tell the World that Gentleman was of his mind? And this they doubted would be diſcovered, and therefore they did not only put the words in Latin, but leave an excuſe if they ſhould be detected, by declaring, if he did not ſay ſo, he ſaid otherwiſe, as is before noted.

38. He doth alſo miſrepreſent my words in telling the World I ſaid, How do you mean prove, *&c.*? I have no ſuch words, nor any thing like them. But ſeeing they have invented a Reply for me, I deſire they would anſwer it alſo. They ſay, the total ſilence of Scripture in this matter is Proof. If I had ſaid ſo, there had been no reaſon to have denied it: For I acknowledg the Aſſertion to be true, tho not then ſpoken by me. But it may now be expected they ſhould make ſome Anſwer to it that might invalidate it; but they only ſet it down, and then run away from it.

Sirs,

Sirs, I desire you seriously to consider, what you have said herein against your own Practice: Is it not a part of Divine Worship? is it not that Holy Ordinance of Baptism as instituted by Christ, that is the matter (in general) of our Disputation? And is it not about the Subjects in particular that we were then speaking of? And were not you called upon with great earnestness, and pressing importunity, to give us but one Instance where it was found written in the Holy Scriptures, That Christ had required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants? And do you (after all) tacitly acknowledg that there is a total silence of Scripture in this matter? Surely it is time then for you to quit your practice, if the Scripture says not one word about it. And if Mr. *Robinson*'s Supposition be allow'd, it must needs be so. Suppose (saith he) Mr. *Chandler* cannot give an Instance, nor no body in the company; you cannot thence infer that none in the World can. To which I answer'd, This is in effect to give away your Cause, when there are so many Men of Parts and Learning present; for if none of them are able to give us one Instance from Scripture for Infant-Baptism, we cannot expect that any body else should. And yet all the Answer they gave, was, to tell us this is only a Trick to turn off the Opponency, notwithstanding I told them the direct contrary. Surely this is no better than tricking in them, thus to fence against those solid Reasons and Arguments that none of them are able to answer; and yet have the confidence to tell the World in print, *p.* 66. That all the Arguments we offer'd were trifling Cavils. Is this your *Impartial Account?*

38. Here they have left out several things that past betwixt me and Mr. *Chandler*; which they have past over with a total silence, because they did not make

for their Cauſe, but againſt it. Is not this great partiality?

39. They bring in Mr. *Robinſon* ſaying, *If you can proceed no farther upon this, then it's time you go on.* Now this is alſo untrue; neither is there one word of it in Mr. *Ring*'s Copy. But the words he ſaith I told them, are theſe; *If you will ſay no more to this, I will proceed to another Argument.* And they know, right-well, that I urg'd this, That if Mr. *Chandler* would confeſs he had no Inſtance to give, I would then proceed to a new Argument. And further, that upon his refuſal ſo to do, I did challenge the reſt of them to give an Inſtance; and provok'd them to it, telling them, That if they refuſed to do it, the People would think they had none to give. And yet none of them could be prevail'd upon to do it. Whereupon I ſpake to this effect, *Gentlemen*, it may be you think I have but one Argument; If you will ſay no more to this, I am not willing to tire the Auditory, I will therefore proceed to a new Argument.

But take notice (by the way) that my firſt Argument ſtands good till you give your Inſtance to the contrary. And all this they wholly omitted in their printed Account, becauſe (perhaps they thought) it would have been ſufficiently evidenced how ſhamefully they had been baffled and put to ſilence before the People, for want of one ſingle Inſtance for their practice.

Here I deſire the Reader to take notice, that I am not yet fully advanced ſo far as three Leaves and a half in their printed Account of the Diſputation; and having diſcover'd ſo many Errors in ſo little a compaſs, it amazes me to think what was become of theſe Mens Conſciences, who could contrive an Account to publiſh to the World, with ſo ſmall regard to

Truth

Truth and Fidelity; when at the same time they send it forth with that plausible pretence of *An Impartial Account*. What may the Reader expect to find in the whole body of it, if there be so many Faults in the very Entrance? But I have other Business, than to attend to the remarking of all they say of this kind: for, if I should do that, I must write a much bigger Volume than is proper upon this occasion, there being so many Errors committed by them throughout the whole of their Book.

In *p.* 65. they confess, that Mr. *Fox* was baptized by dipping. He was dipp'd (say they) not at *Gosport*, but *Havant*. It is not said by Mr. *Duke* that he was dipp'd at *Gosport*, that observation therefore was needless: but that he was dipp'd, they confess, which is the thing asserted by him. But they say 'tis false that it was done by Mr. *Chandler*'s advice, for he was then at *London:* Now it doth not follow that Mr. *Chandler* did not give such advice, because he was (as he saith) then at *London*; for I have receiv'd a Testimony to prove it, under the hands of two Witnesses.

Mr. *Leddell* writes thus, I shall further annex one Testimony touching Mr. *Fox*, which was spoken (the same day the Preliminaries were made) out of Mr. *Chandler*'s own Mouth, which take as followeth.

WE being enquiring, Why they should deny our Practice, and yet practise it themselves? We then had, and several times since have had this Concession from them; That to satisfy a scrupulous Conscience, they could dip any Adult Believer upon profession of Faith. And Mr. *Chandler* did there confess, that Mr. *Earle* had advice for the so baptizing of Mr. *Fox*, in a Letter from him from *London*. And this (tho it may not be in the very words) is the substance

ſtance of the Matter then ſpoken in our hearing, who were preſent at Mr. *Williams*'s Houſe in *Portſmouth*, the 23*d* of *December* 1698.

William Leddell,
Edward Fiſhbourn.

I would further note, That they might have ſpared their Reflection upon our Brother *Duke*, if they had but minded theſe words in my Dedication, *And by another hand I have this Account.* And after all, they thus expreſs themſelves in their own printed Account, *pag.* 65. " But that none of us would refuſe to dip a " Perſon in ſuch a caſe, is true; We never pleading " againſt Dipping as *one* way, but as the only way; " not againſt its Lawfulneſs, but Neceſſity. How doth this agree with what Mr. *Leigh* ſaith in *pag.* 51. I deny that the word *Baptize* ſignifies to dip, in any place of Scripture? But ſeeing Mr. *Sharp* hath already ſpoken to it, I ſhall paſs it by.

I ſhall remark one thing more, and that is, That theſe Gentlemen are pleaſed to reflect upon me about ſpeaking falſe Greek: As they have alſo done upon Mr. *John Goſnold*, by ſaying, I abuſe him in it, when they are his very words I recite, and the ſame words uſed *Heb.* 6. 2. So that rather than I ſhall eſcape their Laſh, the Apoſtle *Paul* (whoſe words they are) muſt alſo be whipt till he learn better, if he come under the tuterage of their unmannerly Pedagogue. What, do theſe Men think no body underſtand *Greek* but themſelves?

But after all, tho they do not charge me with printing any falſe *Greek* in my Narrative (as I perceive) yet they would perſwade the World, that I have got an Art to form *Greek* Letters in the Air, ſo that

that they can discern them, when I express them with my Voice. And in order to convince their Reader, they have put down those *Greek* words wrong in their Narrative, which are printed truly in mine, but falsly in theirs. But any thing to render me ignorant and ridiculous, serves these mens turn, tho never so false in it self. But if I were really as ignorant as they represent me to be, as Mr. *Sharp* hath already told them, I had been the more easily confuted. I shall therefore commit what I have written to the Judgment of the Learned and Impartial Reader, declaring to the World, That my Narrative is much more impartial than theirs, and the best I knew how to publish; which they have only marr'd, and not mended.

To conclude: Seeing this is so, why doth Mr. *Chandler*, *p.* 19. say, that if we will keep strictly to the significancy of a Burial, the Person baptized must not walk into the Water, but be taken up by the Baptizer and thrown into it? for indeed we baptize the Face (saith he) and they baptize the Head and Shoulders too. And (a little after he saith) they had need have brawny Arms and an Herculean Strength to do this, speaking of the Apostles baptizing three thousand in one day with the help of the seventy Disciples; and endeavours to render the thing impossible. As for the possibility of it I refer you to the learned Dr. *Du-Veil*'s Answer to this Objection, in his Explication upon the place.

But as touching the manner of baptizing by dipping, why do you thus quibble about it, and make as if it could not be perform'd aright, if the Subject were not taken up by the Administrator, and thrown into the Water? It's confess'd by your selves in Print that Mr. *Fox* was dipp'd; and in the account which I have received it appears, that when Mr. *Fox* was ask'd this

this Question, Whether, when he was baptized by Mr. *Earl*, it was done by dipping the whole Body under Water? he said, it was; and that in the presence of four Presbyterian Ministers, which they do not deny in their printed Answer, but say that he was dipp'd.

And did Mr. *Earl* indeed baptize Mr. *Fox* by dipping, as you confess, by saying, he was dipp'd at *Havant?* I hope he did not take him up and carry (or throw) him into the Water to dip him; if so, we may know where to have a Man that hath brawny Arms and Herculean Strength. But we do suppose he went with him into the Water (as we do) and when they were both in the Water, Mr. *Earl* did then baptize him by dipping, as our constant Practice is; and this they call dipping. And we do not find that any of those four Ministers present did object against it, as not being the right manner of performing it. Nay, these Gentlemen in their printed Account do not deny the lawfulness of it, *&c.* as hath been observed.

And why (after all this) they should quarrel with us, we cannot understand, when they practise it after the same manner as we do, and call it dipping.

I will add the Testimony of a learned Man to vindicate our Practice.

Lucas Brugensis upon *Mat.* 3. saith, the Party baptized went into the Water as deep as his Thighs, or Navel; the rest of his Body was dipp'd, not sprinkled.

And Mr. *John Calvin* saith upon *John* 3. 22, 23. That *John* and Christ administred Baptism by plunging the whole Body into the Water: and he confesses the Church hath assumed to her self this liberty of sprinkling. But having given them such a Cloud of Witnesses in the Dispute, I shall not here recite them.

Truth Vindicated:

BEING AN

ANSWER

TO A

DIALOGUE

Between a Pedo-Baptist and an Anti-Pedo-Baptist,

Published by *Samuel Chandler*, and *William Leigh*, by the Advice of their Brethren from divers Parts.

Written by one, who was refer'd to the Account of the Dispute at *Portsmouth*, &c. for his Conviction, but hath since separated from the Presbyterians, and now is a Member of a Baptist Congregation.

With Dr. *Russel*'s ANIMADVERSIONS on their Epistle, prefix'd.

Printed in the Year 1700.

Some brief ANIMADVERSIONS by Dr. *Ruſſel*, upon their Epiſtle to the Reader.

THE firſt thing they begin with is wholly falſe: For they ſay, Becauſe Dr. Ruſſel, *or ſome Friend of his, did a while ſince diſgrace the Preſs with ſome ſcraps of their Narrative, ſtuff'd with Nonſenſe and Partiality; nay, and by its Title did delude the Vulgar with an Imagination, that it contained the true State of the* Portſmouth *Diſputation; and the ſame, how unjuſt ſoever, being cheap, hath been ſcatter'd throughout moſt parts of this Kingdom,* &c.

To this I anſwer, That neither Dr. Ruſſel, *nor any of his Friends did ever publiſh any ſuch Paper, nor any other Paper about the Diſpute at* Portſmouth, *beſides their True Narrative, but only an Anſwer to Monſieur* Berault, *wherein they are ſcarcely ſo much as named. But this Paper they ſpeak of (to uſe their own words) was pirated into the World with my Name affixed to it, without my Knowledg or Conſent, therefore I am not chargeable with any Defects or Imperfections therein, tho they are pleaſed unjuſtly to caſt it upon me. But any thing will ſerve your turns to reproach me with, tho never ſo falſe and uncharitable: Your Rage againſt me, is a plain Demonſtration of your being baffled at the Diſputation, tho you have not humility enough to acknowledg it to the World.*

May not I with as much Juſtice charge the Abſtract of your Account upon you? But I have more Charity than to think ſo. And whereas you have put an Advertiſment into the Poſt-man, Nov. 7. 1699. *to diſown it, and ſay, Whereas a Twopenny Paper hath been*

pirated

pirated into the World bearing our Names, and called, An Impartial Account of the *Portſmouth* Diſputation, *we declare it was printed without our Knowledg or Conſent. And this being the firſt opportunity we have to print upon this occaſion, we have told the World the ſame that you do; and therefore thoſe ſilly Reflections of yours might have been ſpared. There are ſome ſuch ill Men belonging to the Printing Trade as will abuſe any body's Works, by contracting and mangling them to get a Penny by; ſo that the beſt of Authors cannot eſcape being abuſed: And if you had but minded your own Advertiſement, you might have known that without giving me the trouble of this publick way of informing you.*

As for thoſe needleſs and vaunting Expreſſions about the ſtrength of the Arguments in your Dialogue, the Reader muſt be Judg of that; and therefore I ſhall not anticipate by making any Reflections thereupon; but deſire him to conſider the Anſwer this Gentleman hath given; and then I doubt not but he will ſee you had no reaſon to boaſt of your ſtrength, before you had obtained ſo much as a ſeeming Victory. I ſhall therefore conclude in your own words: We requeſt of them that they would weigh it in the Balance of Scripture and ſanctified Reaſon; and the Lord give them Underſtanding in all things, which is the deſire of him, who is a Lover of the Souls of all Men, and of his Antagoniſts in particular, being in Charity with them, tho they are not ſo with him.

William Ruſſel.

Truth

Truth Vindicated.

BEING

An ANSWER to Mr. Chandler's *and Mr.* Leigh's *Dialogue.*

THE firſt Argument (ſay they) the Anti-Pedo-Baptiſt offers is this.

Arg. 1. No Infants can be made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men; therefore no Infants can be the Subjects of Baptiſm, according to Chriſt's Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go teach*, &c. (or *diſciple*) *all Nations*, &c.

In *p.* 5. the Anſwer they give to it is as follows, I deny your whole Argument.

In the *Portſmouth* Diſpute they diſtinguiſhed on the word *Diſciple*, ſome were compleat, others incompleat; I perceive the Gentlemen are aſhamed of their former Defence, and it ſeems to me they are conſcious of its weakneſs; and now they will be mad in earneſt, and deny the whole Argument.

They aſſert, 1. If they could not be made Diſciples by the Miniſtry of Men, yet this Text would not exclude them from Baptiſm; but with what reaſon do they do this? none at all truly; and therefore obſerve how this bold Aſſertion will ſtand.

Chriſt ſent his Apoſtles to diſciple all Nations, and then to baptize them; They affirm, if the Apoſtles could not diſciple ſome, yet they might baptize them; this Text excludes all but Diſciples from Baptiſm: they I ſay affirm the contrary without Proof.

That

That which they answer, *p.* 6. This is a weak way of arguing. I answer, If the order of words signify nothing in the Commission as they feign, Why do they not baptize the Adult first, and teach them afterwards? I would I could hear their Answer to this. Not only the Practice of the Primitive Churches, but even all down to this day, yea even themselves keep to the order of the words in this place, and teach the Adult before they baptize them: So that it is manifest some ought to be taught before they are baptized, even by virtue of the Commission; let them prove by the same Commission that some may be baptized before they are taught if they can.

But some were baptized confessing their Sins: Weakly urged! for that Particle (confessing) doth not in propriety of Speech import that their Confession was after their Baptism, but rather the contrary, confessing their Sins they were baptized. But if the order of words in some places were not strictly to be observed, that they are not to be observed here is a weak way of arguing indeed; and seeing themselves keep to the order of the words in respect of the Adult, but not in Infants, let them shew reason for this in the Commission.

But Infants may be Disciples by teaching, *viz.* by their Parents being taught, because the *Kohathites* in their Parents are said to keep the charge of the Sanctuary from a Month old, *&c.*

It is false: the Children of a Month old are not said to keep the Charge of the Sanctuary in their Parents, as you affirm; but all their Males, the young as well as the old, are said to keep the Charge of the Sanctuary. And that the Charge was such that Children of a Month old could not be said to keep it, let them shew if they can.

But *Levi* paid Tithes in *Abraham*. *Answ.* Therefore the great Grandfather's Learning makes the Grandchild a Scholar. O excellent Logick! By the same reason I will prove the Children of Heathens to be the Scholars and Disciples of Christ, and so may be baptized, because some of their Ancestors, *Adam*, *Noah*, &c. were taught and made Disciples.

There did we rejoice———

If the *Israelites* did rejoice in their Ancestors on the Banks of the Red Sea, then *Judas* believed in his Ancestors at the Red Sea, and was a true Disciple; and so the Infants of unbelieving Jews believed in some of their Ancestors, and therefore are Disciples, and may be baptized.

Let the force then of their Scripture-Instances be weighed, and you will see what broken Reeds they bring to support their Cause.

Pag. 6. *line* 23. By the preaching of Men, Parents may be constrained to resign their All to God, and so their Infants.

How is baptizing Infants a resigning them to God? What Scripture or Reason for this?

Line 25. They (*viz.* Infants) are immediately discipled by Mens Ministry, when Parents and Ministers concur in their solemn Dedication to God by Baptism.

I answer.

Then Baptism is not the Dedication of the Infant to God; for, say they, the Parents and Minister concur in their Dedication: but the Parents and Ministers do not concur in their Baptism, for that is the sole Act of the Minister; therefore Infants are not dedicated by Baptism, these Disputants themselves being Judges against themselves.

Line 30. The Master doth, *&c.*

This is altogether foreign to the Controversy, and

I must again observe that they have utterly rejected their Distinction of compleat and incompleat Disciples: And now the resignation of the Parents and the acceptance of the Master is the only means to constitute the relation between Master and Scholar.

Here I demand, 1. where Christ hath manifested his acceptance of all such as are sprinkled in his Name, and hath undertaken to be their Master.

2. If Christ hath undertaken the Tutorage of all such, whence is it all such do not learn of him? Can Christ fail in his Undertaking?

If there be any that won't be convinc'd that Infants are to be baptized by such wise Reasonings, let them let it alone, and be in their Wits still.

Pag. 6. *l.* 33. If Teaching were the ground of this Relation, then Persons long since dead might be our Governors.

O strange! What an Absurdity is here! What Fools were the Jews to say, *We are Moses's Disciples?* Their Argument is this.

It is absurd to say Teaching is the ground of the relation of Master and Scholar.

Job said, the former Age and their Fathers shall teach thee, therefore *Job* spake absurdly. O rare Disputants, that would charge Folly upon the holy Spirit himself!

Were these Mens Eyes in their heads, that bring Scripture to confute themselves?

Nay the Beasts of the Field may be our Masters too, Job 35. 11. *Who teacheth us more than the Beasts of the field, and maketh us wiser than the Fowls of Heaven:* for so it follows in the same Verse. The sense then is either, that none can teach us more than the Beasts of the Field can teach us, and so these Disputants would perswade us that the Beasts are our Masters. And truly had these Gentlemen but attended

well to what might have been learned of the Beasts and the Fowls, they would not have so much despised these Masters.

But alas! these Gentlemen who would now signalize themselves to the World by some new strains of Wit, have altogether mistook the meaning of the Text.

Verse 10. *None saith, Where is God my Maker, who giveth Songs in the night; who teacheth us more than the Beasts of the Earth, and maketh us wiser than the Fowls of Heaven?* In which words *Elihu* affirms,

1. That God giveth Songs in the Night, *i. e.* Matter of Praise.

2. That God teacheth Men more (*viz.*) more excellent things than he teacheth to the Beasts of the Earth, or to the Fowls of Heaven.

Pray, wherein doth the holy Spirit in this place teach us that the Beasts of the Field may be our Masters?

And tho this is not in the Text, yet I fear not to grant, that what thing soever is said to teach us, may be called our Teacher, without any Disgrace to that Assertion they would here oppose, *viz.* that Teaching and Learning make the relation between Master and Scholar.

I wonder they omitted their celebrated Distinction of compleat and incompleat Disciples: What can that do nothing now, that did so much before? The Achillean Shield is not worth a Contention for.

And because they say they expected the *Doctor* should have shewn that that Distinction was groundless, and did not speak directly to it: If leave might be given me, I would press them thus.

No unscriptural Distinction is to be admitted in any controverted Point of Divinity (the reason is, because the Scripture is to be the only Judg.)

This

This Distinction of compleat and incompleat Disciples is an unscriptural Distinction (because neither the words or sense thereof is to be found in the Scripture.)

Ergo, This Distinction is not to be admitted in any controverted Point of Divinity: And therefore not in this now under consideration.

2. If Christ sent not his Apostles to make incompleat Disciples, then they made none such, nor could baptize such.

Again, he that is a Disciple only in an imperfect sense, in perfect sense is no Disciple at all.

A Child (saith Mr. *Leigh* in his Narrative, *p.* 11.) in an imperfect sense is deemed a Scholar.

Ergo, In perfect sense he is no Disciple at all.

So that, our Adversaries being Judges, it is not perfect Sense, and consequently Nonsense to call a Child uncapable of Learning, a Scholar.

And I hope they will allow good Consequence.

I return now to our Dialogue.

Arg. 2. *pag.* 7. *line* 9. Neither ever did *Paul* declare, *&c.*

I answer, *Paul* did declare Believers were to be baptized, and therefore not Infants; we being able to prove Believers Baptism, and you being able to shew no other: Therefore Believers Children ought to be delayed till they can personally profess their Faith.

But you hope to prove Infant-Baptism from *Paul*'s words, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Rom.* 11.

You hope, but are not sure; *Hope that is seen is not Hope; for what a Man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?* Because you do not see Infant-Baptism in those Texts with clear Evidence, therefore you hope but in vain: Only I commend your Modesty here, 'twere Wisdom to give up a vain Hope.

Here is much ſtuff, and impertinent enough in this Page, about the Hiſtory of the World, Ceremonial Law, Prophecies, *&c.* Indeed we cannot ſay this or that Epiſtle contains all Articles of Faith: And tho *Paul* did declare all the Counſel of God, yet he might not write all; this is rational enough. But thus I would argue: If the Scripture is a perfect and compleat Rule of Faith and Practice, and in all the Scripture no mention is made of Infant-Baptiſm; then Infant-Baptiſm is not to be believed to be of Divine Inſtitution, nor to be practiſed by the Saints: The former is true, therefore the latter.

Pag. 8. Pray take your Argument back again, *&c.* Chriſt's Commiſſion doth expreſly ſhew who are to be baptized; but it doth not expreſly ſhew that Adult Perſons, if baptized in Infancy, are to be baptized again: *Ergo.*

I anſwer; The *minor* is falſe for theſe Reaſons.

(1.) Becauſe in every poſitive Command the contrary is forbidden. Diſciples in the Commiſſion are commanded to be baptized; therefore the Commiſſion forbids to baptize thoſe that are not Diſciples, as are Infants.

(2.) Infant-ſprinkling is not Baptiſm; ſurely that cannot be Chriſt's Baptiſm, in which there is not a Subject according to Chriſt's Command, nay tho the Infant were dipped into the Water, no more than if a Heathen Perſon were ſo dipped againſt his Will, it could be called Chriſt's Baptiſm.

And methinks you will hardly deliver your ſelves from our Argument ſo well as we are delivered from yours. But let's hear.

2. I deny that Infants or Adult Perſons are diſtinctly expreſſed in *Mat.* 28. 19. for both are included in the word *Nations.*

If Diſciples are expreſſed, and Infants in no good

ſenſe

ſenſe are Diſciples, then the Subjects are diſtinctly expreſſed: but the former is true; *Ergo.*

If all Nations be the Subject of Baptiſm, according to Chriſt's Commiſſion, without reſpect to being taught, then all may be baptized without being taught: but the Antecedent is abſurd; *Ergo*, ſo is the Conſequent. And what can you ſhew in the Commiſſion that will authorize you to baptize the Infant of a Chriſtian more than the Infant of a Heathen?

Pag. 8. If they are underſtood, then they are not expreſſed: you have confuted your ſelf.

As if what is underſtood, was not expreſſed to the Underſtanding: the word for *them* is Maſculine, but that for *Nations* of the Neuter; the agreement is not between theſe words: For if the Apoſtles were commanded to baptize all Nations without the modification there expreſſed, *viz. taught*, then the Infants of Heathens, by virtue of this Commiſſion, have as much right to Baptiſm as the Infants of Chriſtians; yea Unbelievers had as good claim to that Ordinance as Believers: all which is abſurd, and therefore the word *them* muſt have relation to Believers, to Men diſcipled.

Pag. 9. *l.* 8. Infants may as well be Believers imputatively in their Parents, *&c.*

This is anſwered before, the Text ſaith not as they feign, that the Infants of the *Kohathites* did in their Parents keep the Charge of the Sanctuary.

Parents Faith may be imputed to Infants, *&c.* There was nothing of the Parents coming to Chriſt imputed to the Infants, 'tis altogether vain ſtuff. Our Bleſſings come not on us for our Works ſake, much leſs on our Children for our Works ſake.

That in *Heb.* 11. 29. *By Faith they paſſed through the Red Sea, as by dry Land.*

Is there any mention of the Imputation of the Parents

rents Faith to their Children? Or, is there any neceſſity of ſuch an Inference?

Is it ſaid, all the Children of *Iſrael* paſſed by Faith? Is this indefinite Propoſition equal to an univerſal? Would not the Propoſition be true if only a thouſand of them were Believers? Among all that Multitude are they ſure there were no Orphans that were uncapable of actual Faith? Whoſe Faith then was imputed to them? There went up alſo a mixt Multitude, had they all the Faith of Miracles, and was their Faith imputed to their Infants?

I appeal to all indifferent Men, whether this imputative Faith by them feigned, be not an unheard-of Novelty.

But what can they mean, but that God did account the Infants Believers for their Parents Faith? Well, many of theſe Parents ſoon forgot his Works, became Unbelievers, and conſequently the Parents Infidelity muſt be imputed to the Children, and then they muſt be rejected of God. What Stuff is this? at one time accepted, and at another time falling from this Grace and rejected.

Whereas the truth is, that none are accounted Believers by God but thoſe who are truly ſuch; and thoſe that went through the Red Sea by Faith, were truly Saints, the Text ſaith they were the Children of *Iſrael*; it ſaith not that all of them paſſed by Faith, even the ſix hundred thouſand Men which theſe Gentlemen mention. And they know that an indefinite Propoſition is not always equal to an univerſal, nor is not true in this place.

All to whom Faith was attributed in the 11*th* of *Hebrews* were true Saints: All the natural Seed of *Iſrael* were not true Saints; *Ergo*, Faith is not there attributed to the natural Seed.

But, ſay they, the *Iſraelites* Infants were baptized

 in

in the Cloud, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2. and this was a Type of Gospel-Baptism.

Answ. The *Israelitish* Church was also typical of the Gospel-Church. And if the whole Church were baptized, what doth it teach but that all Gospel-Churches ought to be baptized? But Gospel-Churches are made up of Believers, visible Saints, and not of Infants; therefore this infers not Infant-Baptism, not so much as by a legitimate Consequence.

But (say they) Infants are capable of Baptism, the Subject therein is passive.

The unbelieving Adult are capable of Baptism for the same reason, the Subject therein being passive. Will these Gentlemen then baptize promiscuously all Adult Persons not before baptized (as they phrase it) because they are capable? How frivolous is this? Their Reason lies thus. Every Subject capable of Baptism ought to be baptized: Every Infant is capable of Baptism: *Ergo.*

Let them now go and baptize the Infants of *Jews*, *Turks*, *Heathens*, and then boast they have made so many Christians.

Pag. 10. *line* 13. But neither this nor any one Word of God doth shew that Infants must be denied Baptism, because they cannot do what is required of Adult Persons.

Answ. This is a mistake: For not only this but every other Scripture that shews what is required of a Person in order to his Baptism, doth shew that all those are to be denied Baptism in whom those Requisites are not found. And I reason thus:

If the Scripture hath no where authorized the Ministers to baptize any, but those who professing their Faith in Christ do claim Baptism, then they ought not to baptize Infants: but the former is true; *Ergo.* Or thus.

If

If the Scripture excludes all from Baptism who do not profess Faith in Christ, then it excludes Infants: but the former is true; *Ergo.*

The Assumption is prov'd by this Text under consideration, *Acts* 8. 37. *If thou believest with all thy Heart, thou mayst*, &c. not else. No instance can be given of one baptized who did not profess Faith.

And to affirm the Scripture allows the Baptism of such, for whose Baptism there is to be found in the Scripture neither Precept nor Precedent, is only to affirm, and not to prove.

Let these Gentlemen prove when they write next, that there is an Indulgence given to Infants in respect of their receiving Baptism if they can? Otherwise to talk of one thing required of Infants, and another of the Adult, is altogether vain.

If the Scripture does not, with respect of Baptism, make a distinction between Infants and Adult, then the Minister ought not. And such distinctions as the Scripture is not acquainted with, are devised by shifting heads to deceive themselves and others.

Line 28. I shall quickly shew that the Scripture doth authorize the practice of Infant Baptism, *&c.* Bravely and confidently asserted!

But here is a grant, that the Scripture doth not expressly tell us that the Apostles did baptize Infants.

But this Argument will fall on your selves. The Scripture doth not tell us, that the Apostles did deny Baptism to any Christian's Infant; or administer it to any Adult Person descending from a Christian.

Answ. The Scripture doth not tell us that any Christian Parent did ever offer his Infant Seed to Baptism; how should it then tell us such were denied it?

It is not lawful for us to do in instituted Worship, any

any thing but what is commanded; otherwise you may introduce with the Papists, the Cross, Oil, Spittle and Cream, into the Ordinance of Baptism, yea, and a thousand other Fopperies, and say, the Scripture doth not tell us the Apostles did not use these. And a Papist would uterly rout you, if you durst abide by this Argument.

Page 11. *line* 1. But we have some probable Instances of baptizing Infants.

Even now they would quickly shew, that the Scripture doth authorize the Practice of Infant Baptism; but now their Confidence is turned into probable Instances.

(1.) Acts 16. 33. *He and all his were baptized straightway.* Here I warrant it is probable there were Children: But is it not as probable that there were none? I mean, Infants; and the reason is, he might be old, and his Children grown up, and might be capable of hearing and believing; and that it was so, consult the Text, *And they spake unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his House.* Did they speak to Infants?

But this no more supposeth (say they) that the Word was preached to all, even Infants, than those words, *Mark* 16. 15. *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*, supposes Stones able to hear, *&c.* *All* in one place, and *every* in the other is to be understood with limitation according to the capacity of the Subject.

First here, as I hinted, it may be supposed that the Jaylor was old, and his Children were capable of hearing and believing; and is it not as probable (and much more, because the Word was preach'd to them) than that they were Infants?

But it may be doubtful whether he had any Children at all.

(2.) This

(2.) This *All*, saith he, to whom the Apostle preach'd is to be restrain'd, according to the capacity of the Subject.

And must not that *all* be so restrained, where it is said, *he was baptized and all his straightway?* May we not say by all Infants, they are no more included than where 'tis said, *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*, Stones and Trees are included?

Infants are no more capable of Baptism, according as it was instituted by Christ, and practised by the Apostles, where learning Christ and believing do ever precede it, than Stones and Trees of hearing the Gospel.

And to say as they, some were preached to as included in their Parents, is meer unintelligible stuff.

If some believed in their Parents, others did reject and persecute the Gospel in their Parents with as good reason; and so dying in Infancy every Infant must be accountable for, and damned for the Sins of his reprobate and unbelieving Parents; and so not only *Adam*'s first, but all his Sins, yea all the Sins of unbelieving Progenitors will be charged on their dying Infants. This follows with as good Consequence as that the Word is preached to some in their Parents, and their Parents Faith imputed to them; and is such unreasonable, absurd and unmerciful Doctrine in respect of poor Children, that the like I am perswaded was hardly ever heard of before.

When you can shew that these are as plainly included in the word *Baptize*, as Infants are in the word *Nations*, we shall further consider what you say.

Answ. That Infants are not at all included in the word *Nations* in the Commission is manifest, because there is meant no more of all Nations than are taught or discipled; and, as before is noted, to take *Nations* in the largest extent, then even the Unconverted and

their

their Children also ought to be baptized according to the Commission; which being absurd, it must follow, that only such of all Nations as are discipled by the Ministry are to be baptized. Now pray let us hear, according to your promise, why you do not use Salt, Cream, Oil and Spittle, seeing they are not prohibited in express words in the Scripture.

Pag. 12. *line* 4. I assert, Christ hath required his Ministers to baptize the Infants of professed Christians.

Answ. Required it by good Consequence I warrant, which now I shall attend.

Pag. 12. *line* 8. *Arg.* 1. Those of Nations ought to be baptized, that are not expressly or consequentially excluded by the Word of God; therefore the Infants of professing Christians ought to be baptized.

The *minor* here is to be supplied. But the Infants of professing Christians are not expressly or consequentially excluded by the Word of God. This I deny.

And this they might well have supposed would have been denied, which yet they have not proved, but have turned off the Opponency upon their Adversaries as soon as ever they pretend to take it on them; and say we have not been ever able to prove Infants excluded from Baptism by the Word, which was done by the very Argument they pretend to answer. For,

If Christ hath nowhere required his Ministers to baptize Infants, then consequentially he hath excluded them from Baptism; but the former is true, and these Gentlemen will never be able to shew a Command of Christ for baptizing of them. For,

None ought to baptize any, for baptizing whom he hath no positive Command: for in instituted Worship what is not expressly commanded, is forbidden. For example, In

In making the Tabernacle, Ark, and Cloths of Service, *Exod.* 39. 43. Moſes *looked upon all the Work, and behold they had done it as the Lord had commanded*; not a Tack, Loop, or Curtain, more than commanded. *Moſes* would not ſay, the Lord commanded 50 Loops to a Curtain, but he did not command I ſhould ſet no more, I will therefore put 55; he well knew that being commanded to put 50, more or leſs than that was conſequentially forbidden: So when our Lord commands to baptize ſuch of the Nations as ſhould be diſcipled by the Word, theſe Gentlemen might ſee that thoſe words reſtrain their Commiſſion, and that they ought to account all others excluded from their Commiſſion, but ſuch as were diſcipled by the Word.

Pag. 12. *line* 19. I deny that all things pertaining to an Ordinance muſt be expreſſed in the Inſtitution for that Ordinance.

This they endeavour to prove by this Inſtance.

The Inſtitution for the Paſſover doth not expreſs the Cup, which yet was piouſly uſed by Chriſt himſelf.

Anſw. Seeing the Cup was not mentioned in the Inſtitution for the Paſſover, how did theſe Gentlemen know that it was uſed as part of that Ordinance? I ſpeak of the Cup our Lord took for his Supper. I do read in *Luke* the Cup was took after Supper, that is, after the Paſſover was ended; and that it was a part of the Paſſover, if they have it not from the Inſtitution, how do they know it?

But what if this that they ſay ſhould obtain, that all things pertaining to an Ordinance need not be expreſſed in the Inſtitution? I hope if ſome Circumſtances be not expreſſed, yet they will grant that the principal things muſt: And the Subject in Baptiſm is a principal thing, otherwiſe let them go by that Rule, and baptize Infidels and their Children.

But

But they cannot yet prove even by Conſequence that any Infants ought to be baptized: for by whatſoever words they ſhall prove in this Commiſſion that Believers Infants are to be baptized, only changing the terms neceſſary, I will prove all Infants ought. They only talk of good Conſequences, but bring none.

Pag. 12. Some Infants are Members of the Goſpel-Church viſible, therefore they ought to be baptized.

That Church-memberſhip was a ground of Baptiſm was denied in the Diſpute.

And alſo that ſome Infants were viſible Church-Members.

That Infants, *viz.* Elect Infants, are Members of the Univerſal Church I grant, becauſe redeemed by Chriſt, are ſanctified, and ſhall be ſaved; but who theſe are we know not, it comes not into the Miniſter's Obſervation: And God doth not require Impoſſibilities of his Servants. God hath not made Election, or Redemption, or habitual Grace the ſigns to a Miniſter of doing his Office; becauſe theſe are ſecret things, and cannot come into his Obſervation without a Miracle.

They ſay here, the Infants of Believers are Church-Members before Baptiſm; this we deny if they ſpeak of an inſtituted Church, and they are not able to make it good: That Text *Acts* 7. 38. here quoted, ſpeaks of a National Church, not a Goſpel-Church, which is Congregational, and conſiſts of profeſſed Believers.

Pag. 13. Theſe were Members of the Jewiſh, *&c.*

Here they grant that Members of the Jewiſh Church, without credible Profeſſion of Faith and Repentance, were not to be baptized.

But the Jewiſh Church at that time was the only viſible Church, therefore the Point is gain'd, that viſible Church-Memberſhip gives no right to Baptiſm;

tism; if it did not then, much less doth it now.

I prove they are, *Suffer little Children*, &c. *for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

The Dispute here is, Whether by Kingdom of Heaven, be meant the Church, or Kingdom of Glory? If I suppose the former, what advantage will they get? *Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of such, i. e.* like these in Humility and Meekness is the Gospel-Church. *I say unto you, whosoever humbles not himself as a little Child, shall not enter therein.* What is this to the Baptism of Infants? Nay, should you understand thus, that the Church redeemed by Christ hath some such as these, what is this to Baptism? Who denies these things? But where is the good Consequence to prove from hence Infant-Baptism?

Notwithstanding, I am apt to think that Christ tells them that such as these are received to Glory; these Gentlemen say this cannot be, because every Infant that goes to Heaven drops his Infancy, and enters perfect into Glory.

I demand here, whether it is impossible for God to bring an Infant to Glory?

Wherein lies the Contradiction?

How will these Gentlemen define an Infant? will they tell us it is a Creature rational, but not capable of using Reason? such may be an Ideot, and therefore agrees not to an Infant only: For my part I cannot tell how to define an Infant so as to make it include a Contradiction that it should be such in Heaven. Let's hear how they define an Infant, even a poor little weak thing, *pag.* 34. *line* 4. of their Account.

Well then, how do these Gentlemen know whether in Heaven there be such little Creatures as Infants? Cannot God make the Soul in those little weak Organs act as gloriously as in the Organs of a Giant?

Will

Will these Gentlemen affirm that bodily Strength is one of the Blessings of Heaven? Are they sure there will be need of it? For my part I have been ready to think much, if not the whole of the Glory of the Saints above consisted in the rectitude of their Understandings and Wills.

But as I said, if we should grant these Gentlemen their longing, and suppose that by the Kingdom of Heaven was meant the Church, where is the good Consequence to prove that they must be baptized? I have long waited for one, but still they delay me.

They say, *p.* 14. that the Members of a Christian Church have a right to Baptism: But I despair to find where they so proved it, and I do not think any impartial Judg will give it to them, that Church-Membership gives a right to Baptism, for the reasons before offered against this Opinion.

It was not so in the Jewish Church, much less in the Christian.

Pag. 14. *line* 20. I have shewn before how Infants may be Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

How weakly this was done, let the Reader judg: And we have not said that Infants are uncapable of being made holy, or so uncapable as the Beasts of the Field are; for they have the Seeds of Reason, may be justified, sanctified and glorified. God can do all this to them we say, tho you will not allow Glorification to Infants. But we say Men can no more teach them, and by teaching them make them Disciples, than they can teach the Beasts of the Field.

Arg. 3. The Infants of Believers are called Disciples, *Acts* 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God*, &c.

First, I grant some Persons here are called Disciples, but deny that Infants are so called, as is manifest from the Answer, *pag.* 15. *line* 1.

They are here up again with being taught in their

Parents, so may as well be said to be baptized in their Parents for any thing they have urged to the contrary; but something must be said lest their mouths should seem stopt.

2. They deny that all who are here called Disciples are called Brethren, *ver.* 1. or are said to be taught. This is but a bold denial, the Text is plain, none are intended in this place but the Brethren whom the false Apostles taught; the false Apostles did not preach to their Infants, if they had any such. And *Peter* testifieth of the Brethren, that God had purified their Hearts by Faith, and these he calls Disciples, and not Children, who could not have their Hearts purified by Faith: And tho it was the Disciples of *Cesarea* that *Peter*'s words relate to, yet the case of both, *viz.* those at *Antioch* and these, must be parallel, or *Peter*'s words had not been pertinent.

But say these Gentlemen, cannot God give Infants the Seed of Faith, and purify their Hearts by so doing? *&c.*

Ridiculous enough! do these Gentlemen believe really that to be the sense of the place? Do they think that *Peter* said this from Revelation? Dare they tell the World such stuff to bolster up a tottering Opinion? Is there so much as a probability for such a thing, or any good Consequences? It is manifest *Peter* was speaking of the Brethren, to whom the false Teachers came; for he parallels the case of the Brethren at *Antioch* with those of *Cæsarea*, who received the Holy Ghost, and Faith, and a purified Heart by his Ministry, and if these were not Children, then neither those at *Antioch:* and here is a good Consequence; for otherwise his Instance in them had not been pertinent, which is very absurd to imagine.

The Heart indeed by infusion of holy Habits may be

be said to be purified, but that could not come into the observation even of *Peter* without a Miracle, and here is no need to feign one; I say feign one, because here is no rational ground of such a Conjecture: *ver.* 7. saith *Peter*, *God made choice among us, that the* Gentiles *by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe.* I ask now those reverend Gentlemen, the Authors of this Dialogue, whether those that heard the word from his mouth were Infants? did Infants hear the word of the Gospel and believe? These are the very Persons of whom he testifieth in the *8th vers.* That *God gave them the Holy Ghost*; it is to be understood the extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Ghost: and *ver.* 9. tis said, *He purified their hearts by Faith*; 'tis the same persons still; and yet these Gentlemen feign, that they might be Infants, saying, *And cannot God give Infants the seed of Faith, and purify their hearts by so doing?* Yes indeed he can, but 'twas not done here; and this they knew well enough, if they examined the place, which I perceive they did by their next words: for they say they were the *Gentiles* at *Cæsarea*; and then how disingenuous is it for them to put such a blind upon their Readers, to cheat them out of their Understandings?

And I wonder what these Gentlemen hope to gain to their Cause, by telling us that *Peter* spake here of the *Gentiles* at *Cæsarea*, not those at *Antioch.* This we grant; but how weak was their Answer, just before to suppose them Children.

But I say, if it were not a parallel Case between the *Gentiles* at *Cesarea*, and the Brethren at *Antioch*, to what purpose did *Peter* declare the History of their Conversion?

And that it was so, I prove from the *5th verse* of this same *chap.* compared with the first.

In the first *verse* 'tis said, *Certain men came down from* Judea, *and taught the Brethren, Except ye be circumcised, &c.* not ye and your Children, but your selves. Thence I conclude that these Brethren were men capable of hearing the word, and not Infants. And in *ver.* 5. certain of the Sect of the *Pharisees* which believed, said, *It was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the Law:* but Infants were not capable of such a Command; therefore the Brethren intended in both places are Believers, and not Infants. As to the Equivocations about the manner which they make, this I say, it only shews that these false Teachers would have the Brethren that they taught to have the Foreskin cut off, and it cannot possibly have relation to Children, they being not intended by the false Teachers, or *Paul* or *Peter*, or any other in this place, as I think I have sufficiently demonstrated.

We say Circumcision cannot be the yoke, because Infants did bear it, and because it bound to keep the whole Law. To the first they answer, that it only signifieth a burdensome Yoke. Suppose so, this Yoke was to be laid on proselyted *Gentiles* when adult; and of these the dispute is, and not of Infants at all. And the Apostle saith, *If you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing; verily I say unto every one of you that is circumcised, that he is a Debtor to the whole Law:* this was not spoke to Children but to Believers; and Mr. *Williams* said well, *after the manner of Moses* relates to the Form, not to the Subject.

What if the Yoke would have been laid on Infants, had the false Teachers obtained the point against the Brethren. Yet it proves not in the least the present Dispute was about any other than those that believed, as is manifest fully from what hath been before said, and therefore Infants are not called Disciples in this place.

Page 16. the laſt 3 lines; I have ſeven places at hand, *&c.*

(1.) *Mark* 1. 7. Except they waſh (*i. e.* baptize) they eat not: Were they dipped over head and ears when they did eat? Ridiculous enough; the Text ſpeaks of the Waſhing, *i. e.* Baptizing their Hands. I ask, when they waſhed, whether they did only ſprinkle a little water, or pour a large quantity that did overwhelm them? and ſo for other places, as of Tables, Beds, is it likely it was done by ſprinkling a few drops of water on ſome part of them? Certainly theſe things were covered with Water, when ſaid to be baptized: ſo the *Iſraelites* were covered with Water, and with the Cloud, when in the Sea, which very well figures the Dipping uſed by us. And it is frivolous to anſwer all the impertinencies there utter'd. They never heard that βάπτω, much leſs βαπτίζω did ſignify plunging under Water. But *Stephens* ſaith ΒΑΠΤΩ doth ſignify *mergo, immergo*; and what is this but to dip, drown, or overwhelm, to plunge or dip in? *Item, Tingo quod ſit immergendo*, to dye, becauſe it is done by plunging into the liquor.

Baptizo, he ſaith alſo, ſignifieth *mergo* or *immergo*; Item, *Submergo*: and yet theſe Gentlemen never heard that theſe did ſignify plunging under Water, *&c.* whereas in theſe ſenſes the thing is rather dipt in the Water, than the Water applied to it. So in *Schrevelius's Lexicon*, as ſet forth by *Robertſon*, ΒΑΠΤΩ ſignifieth *intingo & mergo*, to dip in, to ſteep in, as well as *lavo* to waſh; all which ſignify a plunging under Water. And here they own the Author of the Engliſh Annotations to be againſt them. Let the Reader conſider whom he hath moſt reaſon to follow, the former being diſintereſted, and ſpeaking according to his Conſcience, or theſe to ſave their Credit and Reputation. I needed not have ſaid any thing to this

Queſtion, becauſe it is fitter for the Learned than me. Only what I could obſerve I have, the reſt of the Diſpute being not worth taking notice of, as I think, their Objections being frivolous, and not preſſing us at all, and by the ingenious Learned may be turned againſt them.

There have been enough of their own ſide to juſtify our practice, and themſelves pretend to no more than a probability for their practice.

They ſay, we muſt ſo adminiſter it as ſhall conſiſt with the ſafety of the Subject.

God's preſervation of thoſe by us baptized, ſufficiently acquits us from this Cavil.

So much is ſaid of this point by Mr. *Keach* againſt Mr. *Owen*, that an Anſwer may eaſily be tranſcribed thence to all theſe Gentlemens Evaſions.

Page 22. 1 Cor. 7. 14. *Elſe were your Children unclean, but now they are holy.*

Anſw. Holineſs without Chriſt's Command gives no right to Baptiſm. If it was not Holineſs, but God's Command gave right to Circumciſion, then not Holineſs but Chriſt's Command gives right to Baptiſm. *Vid. Keach* againſt *Owen*, p. 109.

Their firſt Argument; Legitimacy cannot deſcend from Believers as Believers. *Anſw.* I grant the Argument, but deny that this Holineſs in the Text deſcends from Believers as ſuch, but from their lawful Marriage; for the ſcruple was, whether the Believer being married to an Unbeliever might live together, becauſe *Ezra* commanded idolatrous Wives and Children to be put away. The Apoſtle ſaith, they may dwell together, and that if the Unbeliever pleaſeth to dwell with the Believer, that then the Believer ſhould not put her or him away, for theſe reaſons, becauſe the Unbelieving is ſanctified by the Believing, elſe were their Children unclean, but now are holy, *viz.* a holy Seed by a legitimate Holineſs. And

And we may obſerve the holineſs of the Seed is of the ſame nature with the holineſs of the Unbeliever, who is ſaid here to be ſanctified.

There is no external relative fœderal Holineſs of Perſons or Things in Goſpel-times. Theſe being but ceremonial and typical, are now done away.

The unbelieving Husband is now ſanctified to or by the Wife, that is, ſanctified for uſe. 'Tis not Whoredom, 'tis not ſin; elſe if it were, your Children were unclean, they would be Baſtards. So ſaith the Scripture, *Mal.* 2. 15. And did he make one, (*i. e.* one Wife) yet he had the reſidue of the Spirit; and wherefore one? that he might ſeek a godly Seed, a Seed according to God's Ordinance of Matrimony.

Not only the Seed of the Faithful, but of Unbelievers alſo, is holy in this reſpect. Marriage is honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled. And had the Apoſtles made their Marriage void, their Children would have been Baſtards, and the Marriage-bed a defiled one. For ſuch as is the Sanctification or Holineſs of the unbelieving Wife or Husband, ſuch is the ſanctification of the Child: but by the former only can be underſtood a matrimonial Sanctification, therefore ſuch is the latter.

And indeed if the Children had from hence an external relative federal Holineſs, the unbelieving Husband or Wife have the ſame, and might as well be baptized.

This Text is well opened by Mr. *Keach* againſt Mr. *Owen*, and our Interpretation defended againſt whatever hath been offered againſt it.

2. But theſe Gentlemen deny the word *holy* to be uſed in this ſenſe in all the New Teſtament.

That the Old Teſtament defends our uſe of the word is ſufficient, as the Text above-quoted doth manifeſt.

But what think these Gentlemen of 1 *Thess.* 4. 3, 4, 5. *For this is the Will of God, even your Sanctification, that ye should abstain from Fornication; that every one of you should know how to possess his Vessel in Sanctification and honour*, &c.

(3.) If Legitimacy were meant, the Apostle would speak false: that is, if these Gentlemen speak true, the words would run thus, say they, If the unbelieving Wife be not sanctified by the believing Husband, your Children would be Bastards. True, if God's Ordinance of Matrimony did not sanctify them to a holy use of each other; but it doth, and therefore this is a silly Supposition, and they had this, while both were Unbelievers, and the Conversion of either doth not dissolve the Marriage-bond.

Besides, it's most probable that the Apostle speaks of the Children they had, while both were unbelievers, because we may justly infer, that the Question was put as soon as one was converted.

Page 23. *line* 6. When you can shew that Bells were once Church-members, *&c.* The Question is, whether Holiness be a ground of Baptism, not whether Church-membership be. The Answer is, *No*, for this reason. If Holiness, *i. e.* relative Holiness, be a ground of Baptism, then Horses Bells must be baptized; for they are said to be holy, *Zech.* 12. 20.

But Horses Bells must not be baptized; therefore a relative Holiness is not the ground of Baptism.

Arg. 2. The Promise is to you and to your Children. This Promise the Infants of penitent Persons have a right to, therefore they have a right to Baptism.

By the Promise is meant either Christ and Salvation by him, or the offer of Christ and Salvation by him.

If the former, then all the Infants of penitent Persons have a right to Christ and Salvation, and not one

one born of Christian Parents can ever perish, except we hold falling from Grace, which I suppose these Gentlemen do not. If by the Promise be understood the latter, the sense is this: The offer of Christ and Salvation is to you, and to your Children, and to all afar off, among the *Gentiles*, whom the Lord shall outwardly call: *Utrum horum mavis accipe.*

I say farther, these words were spoken to Unbelievers, and Impenitent; and no Argument for Infant-Baptism can be drawn from a Promise made to Unbelievers.

Methinks the sense of the words then should be this: That the Apostle spake to the Children of God, to the Elect among these, tho it's like he knew not who they were. Yet such he knew God would call, and therefore casts forth his Net, and leaves God to gather the Fishes together.

And to these Elect he cries, the Promise was to them, and to their Seed, and to all other Elect afar off, whom it should please God effectually to call.

And that thus this place should be understood, appears because God's Promises are certain and sure, and cannot fail of their end. Had God promised Salvation by Christ to all these, they should have certainly had it; had God promised it to their natural Offspring, they also should have had it. But to some God had promised it, even the Elect among these, and their Seed, also the *Gentiles* who are said to be afar off, whom God would call: to none of these did or could the Promise ever fail, because of the faithfulness and power of God, by which he is able and willing to perform all his word.

And tho the Apostle calls on those that believed and repented, by which their Election did appear, to be baptized; yet here is not a reward of their Infants that they should be baptized also.

And

And tho these Gentlemen say that the Apostle here spake impertinently, if he did not intend their Infant-seed; yet it appears otherwise, and that the Apostle would inform them that God had a People as among them, so among their Children, and among the *Gentiles* afar off, whom he would call.

Let us hear the Paraphrase of these Gentlemen; You grown *Jews* and ye *Gentiles*, when called, have a right to Church-Privileges, but your poor Infants, who for many hundred years past have enjoyed the same (whose Infants do they mean here? those of the *Gentiles* also? had they for many hundred years enjoy'd Church-Privileges? sure Gentlemen you are here mistaken) are now through the gracious efficacy of Christ's Death stript of it. Well Gentlemen, what are the Infants of the called *Jews* or *Gentiles* stript of? sure only Shadows, the heavy Yoak of Ceremonies, which a painful Ordinance obliged them to; they injoy all the profitable and good things that the Children of the *Jews* enjoy'd; they have Godly Prayers for them, holy Examples set before them; the Oracles of God in a clearer light than ever the Jewish Infants did enjoy: when they are called, they have clearer views of God, Christ, Heaven, and Glory, than the other could have; and in all things wherein the Gospel excels the Law, the Elect Infants among the *Gentiles*, as they grow up and are called, have a more preferable Dispensation. And why, Ah poor hearts! they never did the least to forfeit it! What Sirs! do we say any real good is taken from them? prove it if you can. What advantage have your Children by their Baptism, as you call it, and feigned Church-membership, above ours? supposing the Parents of both equally holy. Surely this Disadvantage yours have, that they often think themselves safe when they are not, and at best they lose the

the benefit of Christ's Ordinance, and many times go with a doubting Conscience about it all their days.

Indeed, Sir, you may enjoy your Rhetorick, but for any thing argumentative therein, you had as good let it alone.

Pag. 25. *line* 3. We have another of Mr. *Baxter's* Arguments, God did not cast out those Infants in Judgment or Mercy to them.

Yes, Sir, in Mercy he hath taken away the bitter and left the sweet, yea he hath given better Sweets than the other enjoy'd. I speak of the Elect among both; as for the other nothing is really good to them, therefore they can lose no good.

I have above suggested, what greater Good elect Children enjoy now, than the Elect then; and so there is a fair end of this Argument.

(2.) Not one Privilege of the Covenant of Grace was ever taken away by the Death of Christ.

'Tis granted; but that external Privilege of Infants Church-Membership is no Privilege of the Covenant of Grace. The Jewish Nation, as such, were not under the Covenant of Grace: If you think otherwise, pray reply to Mr. *Keach*.

As for what you say, that the Jewish Infants had a visible right to the Covenant of Grace:

If some, then all of them, how wicked soever their immediate Parents were, and how visible soever their Wickedness, Unbelief, and Impenitency was; pray will you consider this, and tell me what right the Infant of a flagitious ungodly Professor hath to Baptism by your Principles, and yet how by this Argument you can deny to baptize such, seeing they could not refuse to circumcise such, and Baptism is a Privilege of the Covenant of Grace, but of Children you cannot determin who are in Covenant. You say they had a visible right. I ask, had they visibly a right to the

Blessings

Bleſſings of the Covenant? What! and enjoy none of them, neither Election, Adoption, Juſtification, Sanctification, or Glorification. Surely their right in the Covenant could not be very viſible, when there was none at all, which was the caſe of an infinite number of theſe viſible Members. Do you not read, *all are not* Iſrael, *that are of* Iſrael; nor becauſe they are the Seed of *Abraham*, are they all Children; thoſe that are the Children of the Fleſh, are not therefore the Children of God, but the Children of the Promiſe are accounted the Seed. 'Tis, Gentlemen, the Elect that are concluded in the Covenant of Grace, and the Intereſt of theſe in that Covenant is not, nor ever was viſible till their Converſion, except a ſpecial Revelation concerning them intervene.

To talk that any are viſible Members of the Covenant of Grace before their Converſion to God is viſible, is not a true but monſtrous kind of Charity, that the Scripture no where hath taught.

Pag. 26. The Infants of Gentile Converts are not kept out, becauſe Jews and Gentiles have the ſame Privileges in Chriſt; that is, thoſe who are really in Chriſt: but this makes not for their purpoſe, for not the Children of *Abraham*, or the *Jews*, as ſuch, were really in Chriſt; not becauſe they are the Seed of *Abraham* are they all Children, ſaith the Scripture: And may not I ſay, not becauſe they are the Seed of the Saints, are they all the Children of God. How are theſe viſibly then the Children of God?

I often find theſe Gentlemen calling their Narrative of the *Portſmouth* Diſputation, their impartial Account, wherein they are the Trumpeters of their own Praiſe.

But to any indifferent Reader their Impartiality will ſeem queſtionable; and I would have them think that to honour themſelves is nothing worth.

As

As to their boasting that they have proved the Infants of Believers holy Persons, Church-Members, Disciples, and this in a Scripture-sense, is but a vain Boast. These being the things in Controversy, should have been left to the judgment of the Reader, and their Modesty then would have been praised; whereas so great Presumption on such small grounds argues great Conceitedness and Value of themselves.

And methinks I cannot but take notice of the concern of these Gentlemen; they never think they have fully defended themselves, else why comes out this Dialogue? and yet their Cause is not one whit bettered, but their Weakness more manifest: For now we see the strength of all their Wit, sure nothing more can be expected from them, I mean nothing stronger; for this is midwiv'd into the World with the best Advice, and most mature Deliberation, and as a Correction of their former Faults.

The People could not but expect some strange Production after so many Essays from these Mountains; but their Expectation is at last deluded, and behold a ridiculous Mouse, the Matter of their Scorn and Laughter.

FINIS.

A

SERMON

Preach'd

From the Commiſſion,

Matth. 28. 19.

IN THE

Baptiſt Meeting-houſe at *Wallup*, at the deſire of ſome Friends.

To which is prefix'd a LETTER to Mr. *Leigh*, written after the *Portſmouth* Diſpute.

By *JOHN WILLIAMS*, Paſtor of a Baptized Congregation.

London, Printed in the year 1700.

Mr. William's *LETTER to Mr.* Leigh, *written after the Disputation.*

BRother *Leigh*, for so I can heartily call you, and own you if you please to accept of it: the occasion of writing these few Lines to you is this. I have in my reflex Thoughts weighed what was offered upon both sides in the Dispute; not being willing to abide by any thing that has not a foundation in the Word, nor to reject any thing that is offered against my present Opinion, could I see it were bottomed on the Word, because I know I must one day be judged by the Word. You told me you could have said four times more for our Cause than was spoken by us, and ten times more than you did for your own. Possibly you might have spoken four times as many words as we did: but I think it would have been a hard task to have offered Arguments that had four times more weight and substance than those had that were offered by us; I mean for clearing the Point of the Subject according to the Commission which the first Preliminaries bound us to: yet I would not undervalue your Abilities, nor set our own in competition with yours: had we not had Truth on our side, your Abilities would soon have overturn'd mine. The *Doctor*, I think, might be able to cope with any of you in that respect: but if you can offer four times more for our Cause than we did, I wonder your own Arguments should not be convincing to you, tho ours were not; and could we have that fourfold Strength added to our Arguments, I believe you would not be able to answer one of them. For so weak as our Arguments were, you did no otherwise answer them but by denying a part, which is an easy way of answering the strongest Argument that can be offered: and if you could have offered ten times more for your own Cause, why had you not done it? you might have had the Opponency soon turn'd upon you, when the *Doctor* gave you an Argument containing an universal Negative; and,

and, as I do since understand, you ought to have accepted it, according to the Rules of Disputation in the University, from whence you take these Rules: I am informed that a universal Negative is taken for a Maxim. I thought that artificial Logick had been the Improvement of natural Reason; but if this be a Rule to be observ'd in it, that the Opponent must prove an universal Negative, I know nothing that is more contrary to natural Reason: had there been either Precept or Precedent for Infant-Baptism on Record, then it had been possible for you or some body else to have produced it; and had you done it, his Argument had been gone, and you had gained the Cause: but it is impossible for a Man to prove, that neither you nor any one else can produce such a Record, otherwise than to deny that there is any such Record to be produc'd. If this be according to the Rule of Disputation, I look on it as an effectual way to keep People in ignorance. I suppose, that if you could have produc'd a Record either of Precept or Precedent for Infant-Baptism, you would not be tied so close to the Rule of Disputation, as not to have brought it to light.

Whatever you could have said, I know not; you know you did not give us an instance for Infant-Baptism, tho it was often desired, and that with great Importunity: and must we still look on Infant-Baptism to be an Ordinance of God, a part of Divine Worship, that hath neither Precept nor Precedent for its Practice? But, Sir, if you can say ten times more for your Practice than you did, it is not too late to offer it yet; and if you please to send it me, and it be such as is convincing, I will spread it for you; if not, I will fairly answer it, and not publickly spread it. Sir, when I consider what was offered by us, and denied by you, and with what Props your own Arguments were supported, being Men of such Parts and Piety as you are, on whose Credit the Ordinance of Christ is like to be administred to a wrong Subject for the future, as it hath been for Ages past upon a like traditional Bottom; I am really grieved, and that is the reason of my setting Pen to Paper.

First, when I consider what was offered by us, and denied by you. I can repeat my own Arguments better than

I can the *Doctor's*, and therefore I shall confine my self to them: You know you prest us to allow of Consequences rightly drawn from the Word; the *Doctor* told you you should give it which way you could: but did you not deny almost, if not all the Consequences that were offered by me to prove that Infants were not the Subjects of Baptism, according to the Commission? A Negative Task that we were put upon, which could no otherwise be proved but by Consequences. To repeat some of my Arguments, and I need repeat but the *major* for the most part. My first Argument was this, That if Believers are the only Subjects of Baptism according to the Commission, then Infants are not. Here you denied the Sequel; but if the Antecedent be true, the Consequent is true, and rightly drawn from the Text.

There being none put into the Commission as the Subjects of Baptism but Believers, *Mark* the *16th*, and *17th*, you did not deny the Antecedent, how then could you deny the Consequent? My second Argument was this, That if Infants are incapable of believing, then they are not the Subjects of Baptism, according to the Commission; but they are so. Here you denied the *minor*, which I wonder at, that you should be of the Judgment that Infants are capable of believing; yea, your denying the *minor* speaks as much. My third Argument was, If the Essence of Faith consists in the Act of the Understanding and of the Will, then Infants are incapable of believing. Here you denied the Sequel; you did not deny but that the Essence of Faith consists in the Act of the Understanding and of the Will, and if you had, it would have been proved; but how could you deny the Sequel?

Are Infants capable of apprehending Christ in his Natures, and in his Offices, for so he must be apprehended as the Object of Faith? Are Infants capable of consenting Christ to be theirs, and they Christ's in all his Offices, which is the Act of the Will that follows the Act of the Understanding? Can Infants make a Resignation of themselves to Christ to be taught by him, and saved by him, and ruled and governed by him? Can you prove by the Word, that there is such a Capacity in Infants, or that there is such a

Capacity

Capacity in the Children of Believers, considered as such, and not in the Children of Unbelievers? My fourth Argument was, That if none could believe on Jesus Christ, that never heard of Jesus Christ, then Infants are incapable of believing. Here again you denied the Sequel. You know there are Scriptures enough to prove the Antecedent in every Proposition, and the Consequent was rightly drawn; so that you had no more ground to deny the Consequent than you had to deny the Antecedent, yet you denied them all: and thus you might have run me up *ad infinitum*, by a continual denying, without rendring any reason for what you did, or discovering any Fallacy in any one of my Arguments. The Arguments you offered your self are judged by some to have little weight in them, and that by Pedo-baptists as well as others: Your first was, That if Children are Church-Members, then they have a right to Baptism, the initiating Ordinance; but they are so, *&c.* The *minor* being denied, you brought *Mat.* 19. *Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.* You indeavour'd to prove, that by the Kingdom of Heaven was meant the Visible Church: I denied it, and offered an Argument to the contrary; That if Infants were not Members of a particular instituted Church, nor of the universal visible Church, out of which a particular instituted Church was gathered; then they were not visible Church-Members: but they are not, *&c.*

You told me it did not belong to the Respondent to form an Argument, that was all you replied to it; then I denied your *major*, that Church-Membership was the ground of Baptism: I brought *Mat.* 3. and *Luke* 3. and show'd you, that those that came to *John* to be baptized and were denied, were Church-Members; you replied that they were Church-Members *de facto*, but not *de jure*. I ask'd you whether you did own them Church-Members *de facto*? you said you did: Then said I, Church-Membership is not the ground of Baptism; you said again, they were not Church-Members *de jure*, for by the Law they ought to have been cast out: I desired you to produce that Law, but you could not do it. And now, Sir, I would offer you two things which were not then mentioned. First, Suppose a Grant, that by the Kingdom

of Heaven is meant the Church of the *Jews*, that was then a National Church, yet your Argument is impertinent.

This was before the Commission was given out, at which time it is granted, that Children were Church-Members; but if you would argue from Church-Membership to a right to Baptism, you must prove that they are now Church-Members under the new Dispensation. The Constitution of the Church being changed from National to Congregational, the Matter of which is visible Saints, and that is, such as in the judgment of Charity are inherently holy; and the Form, mutual Consent and Agreement; and that Church-Membership is put into the Commission to be the ground of Baptism: for if you prove not their right to Baptism by the Commission, you do nothing, and this I think will be too hard a Task. Secondly, When Children were Church-Members, Church-Membership was not the ground of Baptism; Christ and *John* never baptized Church-Members, considered as such, but first made them Disciples, and then baptized them, *Joh.* 4. 1. they were Church-Members before they were Disciples of Christ, and they were made Disciples before they were baptized. Your second Argument was, That if Infants are Disciples, then they are the Subjects of Baptism according to the Commission; but they are so, *&c.* The *minor* was denied. Now pray consider what weak Props they were you fortified your *minor* with; at first you said, a Child was a Disciple as soon as his Parents had dedicated him to be taught: But do you think he is a Disciple by Instructions according to the Commission, and so a fit Subject to be baptized, not having learn'd Jesus Christ? Secondly, Do the Parents dedicate their Children to be taught while Infants, when they desire you to baptize them? or do you undertake to teach them while Infants, or do you ever look after them, indeavouring to teach them? You say a Child is a Scholar the first day he goes to School, tho he hath learnt nothing; but is he a Scholar before he goes to School, or a Scholar by Instruction, when he hath learn'd nothing? You baptize them before they go to School, before you go about to teach them; will Christ look on these as Disciples to

him

him by the Miniſtry of the Word, or on you Miniſters as keeping cloſe to the Commiſſion? Theſe things will not hold at the great Day, when the Commiſſion ſhall be laid open again. Bear with me that I ſpeak ſo plain, for it is the Cauſe of Chriſt that I am now pleading; his great Commiſſion, wherein his Kingly Authority is ſo highly concerned, may be duly obſerved, and the Ordinance duly adminiſtred. However Children may be accounted Scholars by us in an improper ſenſe the firſt day they go to School, tho they have learned nothing; yet I ſhewed you, that *Philip* did not account the Eunuch a Scholar, tho he had actually ſubmitted himſelf to be taught by him, and he had taught him till he underſtood by his verbal Profeſſion, that he had learned Jeſus Chriſt; that is, indeed a Diſciple of Chriſt, that hath learned Jeſus Chriſt, and ſo learned him as to deny himſelf for Jeſus Chriſt, *Luke* 14. 27, 28. Nor do I believe that you do look upon all that you have preached the Goſpel unto to be diſcipled unto Chriſt, and ſo fit Subjects for Baptiſm according to the Commiſſion. What you offered from *Acts* 15. has no foundation in the Chapter, the Controverſy being about the Brethren, not the Infants; and the Yoke not being Circumciſion barely conſidered, but the falſe Doctrine together with Circumciſion, which Doctrine could not be impoſed on Infants, tho Circumciſion might. You aſſerted that Infants are a part of a Nation, and yet I am ſure you will not baptize upon this ground your ſelves, why then did you offer it to us? The vileſt Wretches that are, and the blackeſt Heathens in the World are part of a Nation; will you baptize ſuch? Really I ſhould bluſh to look back on ſuch an Argument. I have written theſe Lines in Love, hoping that on ſecond thoughts things may be better conſidered; and that you will not ſtand by that you have not the Word to ſtand by you in. The Commiſſion ſaith that, *He that believeth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved.* Do you believe that all the Infants that you baptize ſhall be ſaved? if not, then you do not believe that they are all Believers, and yet you baptize them as ſuch. That Faith that fits the Subject for Baptiſm, it is a believing with all the Heart;

see *Pool's* Annot. on *Acts* 8. 37, 38. it is such a Faith as doth evidence the Subject's right to Salvation, *Mark* 16. 16. I shall offer you one Argument, and so conclude: If the Apostles that were injoined to teach the Observation of all things whatsoever Christ had commanded them, never taught the Observation of Infant-Baptism, then Infant-Baptism was never commanded them by Christ; but they did not, *&c.* I shall now take leave, and remain your truly loving Friend,

John Williams.

Mr.

Mr. *Williams*'s Sermon.

Matth. 28. 19. *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.*

BEfore I come to the words themſelves, I ſhall give you a brief account of this Chapter, and of ſome remarkable Paſſages contained therein. *Verſ.* 1. we have the Women coming to the Sepulcher, and the time of their coming, which was at the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the firſt day of the Week. *Verſ.* 2. we have an account of a great Earthquake, together with the cauſe thereof: *The Angel of the Lord deſcended from Heaven, and rolled away the ſtone from the door, and ſate upon it.* *Verſ.* 3. we have a deſcription of this Angel, or this extraordinary Meſſenger which was ſent from Heaven. 1*ſt.* He is deſcribed by his Countenance, *His Countenance was like Lightning.* 2*ly.* By his Raiment, that *was white as Snow.* *Verſ.* 4. we have the effect of this Apparition, with reſpect to the keepers: *They are aſtoniſhed at the ſight; for fear of him the keepers did ſhake, and became as dead men.* *Verſ.* 5, 6, 7. we have the Angel talking with the Women, in which there are three things obſervable: Firſt he gives them a Caution, *fear not:* tho the Keepers did fear this bright ſhining Angel, yet the Women ſhould not fear; their end was good in being there, they came in love to Jeſus Chriſt: *I know that ye ſeek Jeſus that was crucified.* Secondly, He preacheth unto them the Reſurrection of Chriſt; the firſt tidings of this welcome News ſounded in their ears: *He is not here, he is riſen, as he ſaid: come ſee the place where the Lord lay.* Thirdly, he ſends them on a haſty errant; *Go quickly and tell his Diſciples, that he is riſen from*

the dead; and behold he goeth before you into Galilee: *there shall you see him, lo I have told you. Verſ.* 8, 9. the Women return from the Sepulcher; and firſt we have the manner how, and that was *with fear and great joy.* Secondly, the ſpeed they made; they *did run to bring his Diſciples word.* No doubt they thought it would be welcome News to the Diſciples, as it was to themſelves. Thirdly, They have a ſhort ſtop by the way, being met by the Lord Jeſus, who ſaluted them with all hail: *Peace be unto you,* or rejoice. Upon this they came and held him by the feet, and worſhipped him. *Verſ.* 10. and here obſerve: Firſt Jeſus Chriſt gives them another caution; *Fear not.* Secondly, he ſends them forward in their Errant: *Go and tell my Diſciples that I go before them into* Galilee, *there ſhall they ſee me.* Verſ. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. we have a Narration of the Watchmens coming into the City, to acquaint the Chief Prieſt with what was done; and of the way they took to ſtifle the bleſſed Tidings of the Reſurrection of Chriſt: *They gave them large mony to report, that his Diſciples came by night and ſtole him away while they ſlept. Verſ.* 16. tho the Diſciples were not forward to believe that Chriſt was riſen, yet they go *into* Galilee, *and into a mountain, where Chriſt had appointed them. Verſ.* 17. Chriſt comes, and ſhews himſelf to his Diſciples, according to his promiſe: and here we may ſee the effect of his coming; *When they ſaw him they worſhipped him, but ſome doubted:* that is, they doubted for a time; but at laſt they believed. *Verſ.* 18. he declares to his Diſciples the full and ample Power that he was inveſted withal: *All Power is given unto me, in Heaven and in Earth.* By this Declaration he prepares his Diſciples to receive their Commiſſion; which Commiſſion you have in *ver.* 19, 20. together with an incouraging Promiſe of his own Preſence; *Lo I am with you always, unto the end of the world.* My Text contains in it two Branches of the Commiſſion; to teach, and baptize. In which words we may obſerve theſe general parts: Firſt, we have their miſſion, or ſending; *Go ye therefore.* Secondly, we have the Subject, *All Nations.* Thirdly, their work, and that is two-fold: *1ſt,* To teach; and *2ly,* To baptize: In which there is the order to be obſerved; they

must first teach, and then baptize. 3*ly*, We have the Subjects of Baptism, in this word *Them:* which word is a Relative, the Antecedent is *All Nations*, taught or disciples. 4*ly*, We have the Authority of the Ordinance in these words: *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Before I give you the Observation, I shall a little open the Terms.

First, As to their mission or sending, *Go ye therefore*; there are three things to be inquired into:

1. Who it is that sends, and that is the Lord Jesus Christ, as appears in the preceding *Verse*, *Jesus came and spake unto them, and said, go ye.*

2. Who they are that are sent; First more immediately they are the eleven Disciples, as appears by *ver.* 16, 17, 18. *Then the eleven went away into* Galilee: *and Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, Go ye.* But more remotely, all such as God should be pleased to gift, and qualify by his Spirit to preach the Gospel, and by his providence to call out, and to open a door so to do. The Eleven were here commissioned, but the Commission was not restrained to them: for First, we find that there were others that did instantly preach the Gospel, as well as they, who had no other Commission but this, *Acts* 11. 19, 20. *They that were scattered abroad upon the Persecution, preached the word not only to the* Jews, *but to the* Gentiles *also.* Now there was no Commission to preach to the *Gentiles* but this; therefore it must be by this commission, or none at all. I can't suppose that they did run before they were sent: for the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned to the Lord; and if sent, it was by virtue of this Commission. These were not the Apostles that preached unto the *Gentiles*, but such as were scattered abroad, when the Apostles stayed at *Jerusalem*, *Acts* 5. 1. compared with the 4*th.*

(2.) It's by virtue of this Commission that the Gospel is preached at this day, and the promise of his Presence which is annex'd to it, remains to this day: *Lo I am with you always unto the end of the World.*

(3.) Why did Christ send them? this word therefore carries

carries us back to the 18*th Verse*, *All power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth*; *Go ye therefore*: He had power to send them, and now he exerts his Power.

Secondly, What are we to understand by *All Nations*; there is no great dubiousness here, the Commission is now inlarged unto the *Gentiles*, that was before restricted unto the *Jews*. It's to all Nations, as Providence should direct them, and open a door to them: for there was a hand of Providence in steering their course, *Acts* 16. 7. *They essayed to go into* Bithynia, *but the Spirit suffered them not.* *Mark* renders it thus: *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*; that is, To every rational Creature among the Sons and Daughters of Men: Angels are rational Creatures, but Ministers are not sent to preach the Gospel to them. 2*ly*, It must be such as have the use of their Reason among the Sons and Daughters of Men: Children in an Infant-state are rational Creatures, but they have not the use of their Reason and Understanding, they are not capable of hearing and receiving the word; it would be but lost labour to preach the Gospel to them: Ministers are not bound by their Commission to preach to Children in an Infant-state. And here by the way observe, that if Ministers are not bound to preach the Gospel to Children in an Infant-state, then they are not bound to baptize them in an Infant-state: for they must first teach before they baptize; that is, the same Person: Not teach one, and baptize another that was never taught.

Thirdly, What are we to understand by this word *teaching*? 1. To teach and to preach is the same thing, as appears by comparing it with *Mark* 16. 15. it's the same Commission; and there it's said, *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature.* To teach or to preach then is to open and interpret the word by the word, and to apply it: To preach the Gospel is to preach Christ crucified, buried, and risen again, 1 *Cor.* 15. 1, 2, 3, 4. it is to declare the Doctrine of Christ contained in his word, to press men by the word, and exhort them to believe in Jesus Christ; with assurance from the promise of Christ, that *whosoever believeth shall be saved*; *Mark* 16. 15, 16. *Luke* 24. 47.

2. To

2. To teach here, is to disciple to Christ: it's granted by them that understand the Greek, that the word is to make Disciples, or to bring Disciples to Christ, or to disciple to Christ. First then a Disciple is a Scholar, one that learns: So the English Schoolmaster defines the word. *Wilson* in his Dictionary, tells you that a Disciple is a Learner, a Scholar, one that submitteth to another to be taught; one who learneth the doctrine of Christ, that he may believe and practise it: The word does import as much in Scripture, *John* 9. 27, 28. and he said unto them, *Will you be his Disciples?* they answered him, *Thou art his Disciple, but we are* Moses's *Disciples.* What does this import but that they had learned the Doctrine of *Moses*, and that they would not learn of Christ? it's observed, the word is sometimes translated learned, *John* 6. 45. *Every one that hath heard, and learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* And so the word Undiscipled is translated Unlearned, 1 *Pet.* 3. 16. A Disciple of Christ then is one that hath learned Jesus Christ, and so learned him, as to deny himself for Christ.

1. He is one that hath learned Jesus Christ, *John* 6. 45. *Every one that hath heard or learned of the Father,* (or is discipled of the Father) *cometh unto me.* A Person can't come to Jesus Christ, till he have learned Jesus Christ; the act of the Understanding must precede the act of the Will.

2. He is one that hath so learned Christ, as to deny himself for Christ, *Luke* 14. 26. *If any man come to me, and hate not his Father, and his Mother, and his Brethren, and Sisters, yea, and his own Life also, he cannot be my Disciple.* This hatred here may not be understood of a positive hatred, but of a less loving; the Soul must love Christ more than these, or he must love these less than Christ, *ver.* 27. *And he that taketh not up his Cross, and follows me, can't be my Disciple.* Vers. 33. *And whosoever it be of you, that forsaketh not all that he hath, cannot be my Disciple.*

3. A Disciple here in my Text, and a Believer, *Mark* 16. 16. is the same thing; for it's the same Commission, tho variously expressed, and the various terms or expressions do help to explain each other. *Calvin* in his Institutions observes, that the words Disciple and Believer, are two

words

words to expreſs the ſame thing; and that *Luke* in the *Acts* does often make uſe of the word Diſciple for Believer, *Act.* 6. 1. *When the multitude of Diſciples were increaſed*; that is the multitude of Believers, *Acts* 11. 26. the Diſciples (that is, Believers) were firſt called Chriſtians at *Antioch*, *Act.* 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God to lay a Yoke on the neck of the Diſciples?* Theſe Diſciples were ſuch as had purified their hearts by faith, *ver.* 9. And what were the Diſciples that came together to break bread? *Acts* 20. 7. Were not they Believers? To teach then, is to diſciple them unto Chriſt or to bring them to believe in the Lord Jeſus.

Firſt, Sometimes by Baptiſm, we are to underſtand the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, *Acts* 1. 5. *And you ſhall be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt not many days hence.* This was done when the Spirit appeared in the form of Cloven Tongues, and ſat upon them, *Acts* 2. 3, 4.

Secondly, By this word Baptiſm, is ſometimes underſtood Afflictions, Sufferings, *Matth.* 20. 22. *You ſhall indeed drink of the Cup that I am to drink of, and be baptized with the Baptiſm that I am to be baptized with.*

Thirdly, By this word we are ſometimes to underſtand Water-baptiſm, that which is an Ordinance of Chriſt: *John* did baptize in *Enon*, for there was much Water: and in this ſenſe I take the word here for Water-baptiſm, and that for this Reaſon: It's a Baptiſm that is to be adminiſtred by the Meſſengers or Miniſters of Chriſt. Now they can adminiſter no other but Water-baptiſm; they can't baptize with the Holy Ghoſt, that muſt be done by Chriſt: nor they may not baptize with the Baptiſm of Afflictions, that's work for the Enemies of Chriſt; they can no otherwiſe baptize but with Water.

Fourthly, What are we to underſtand by this word *Them?* This word reſpects the Subjects of Baptiſm; it's a Relative, the Antecedent is *All Nations*, taught or diſcipled to Chriſt: *Go diſciple to me all Nations, baptizing them*; that is, them that are diſcipled.

Fifthly, What by theſe words, *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt?* This is the form of words that is to be uſed in Baptiſm, and it's a part of the

form

pon of Baptism, and doth denote one or both of these.

1. Their being baptized into the Doctrine of the Trinity, which is owned and profest by those that are to be baptized.

2. To baptize by the Authority of the Trinity: To baptize in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is to baptize by the Authority of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. From the words I shall give you this Observation, or Point of Doctrine:

Doct. *That Believers, or such as are discipled to Christ by the Word, are the only Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission; these are to be found in the Commission, and there are no other to be found there; nor is there any other Commission left on Record for Ministers to baptize by.*

In the Prosecution of this Point, I shall, *First*, Give you a Description of Baptism. *Secondly*, Prove the Point. *Thirdly*, Answer some Objections. *Fourthly*, Give one Reason. *Fifthly*, Make some Application thereof.

First, I shall give you a Description of Baptism. Baptism is a dipping a Believer in Water by a Minister of Jesus Christ, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Here is in this Description the Administrator, the Subject, Matter, and Form.

1. The Administrator, that must be a Minister of Christ, and one that hath Commission from Christ to preach the Gospel: *Go preach and baptize.* Now here I do not tie it to a Minister in Office, that is, to an Elder, one that hath a Pastoral Relation to a particular People, but to a preaching Disciple: Baptism being no more tied to Office or Power, than Preaching is; Preaching is not restrained to Office or Power by the Commission, as I have shewed already: every one that is gifted and qualified by the Spirit, and providentially call'd, ought to have Commission to preach, *Acts* 11. 20. therefore such have Commission to baptize, *Go teach and baptize.*

2. The Subject must be a Believer, *Acts* 8. 37. *If thou believest with all thy Heart thou mayst*: the contrary that fairly offers

offers it self is this, If thou dost not believe with all thy Heart, thou mayst not.

Object. But some may say, the Administrator can't possibly know whether the Subject do believe with all his Heart, or no.

Answ. I grant it's true, yet it follows not but that the Subject ought so to believe; a true Faith is required of the Subject to give him a right to the Ordinance, as appears by the forementioned place; *If thou believest with all thy Heart, thou mayst.* A Profession of Faith gives the Administrator a Call to administer the Ordinance, *Acts* 5. 13. *Then* Simon *himself believed* (that is, he made a Profession of Faith) *and was baptized:* and so the Eunuch upon a Profession of Faith was baptized by *Philip*, and the Commission gives him authority to administer the Ordinance.

3. The Matter is Water, that is the Element that the Subject is baptized in. John *was baptizing in* Enon, *for there was much Water*; John 3. 23. *Who can forbid Water, that these should not be baptized, that have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* Acts 10. 47.

4. The Manner or Form, and that is by dipping, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

(1.) It is by dipping; it's granted almost by all, that the word in the Commission signifies to dip, or to plunge into the Water, and signifies such a Washing, as when Linen is plunged or dipp'd in Bucks: this is confest by Dr. *Featly*, who was a great Antagonist against the Baptist Interest. What he after speaks concerning the baptizing of Beds, and Cups, and brazen Vessels, that it was done without dipping, is more than can be proved; that being a superstitious Practice of Pharisees, I suppose they would not stick at the trouble of dipping: but it's enough that he grants that the primary signification of the word is to dip. The Church of *England* grants it to be by dipping, and admits of no other way by their Rubrick for the baptizing of Children, but by dipping, except the Child be weak: They say, if the Minister be certified that the Child be strong, and able to bear it, he shall dip it discreetly and warily.

Erasmus's

Erasmus's Paraphrase on the New Testament reads it thus, *Go and teach all Nations, and when they have learned dip them.* The Addition to *Pool*'s Annotation tells us, that it's apparent, that both Christ and *John* did baptize by dipping, *John* 3. 23. It is observed by those that understand the Greek, that the word that is often translated dipped, or dippeth, comes from *bapto*, which is the primitive word that signifies to dip. And here give me leave to transcribe a few Lines made ready to my hand, by one that understands the Greek: *Mat.* 26. 23. *He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish:* here the word is *embapsas*, the Participle of *embapto*, which is *bapto* in Composition, and signifies the same. *Mark* 14. 20. *He said, it is one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish:* here the Participle of the Passive Voice of the same Verb is used (to wit) *embaptomenos*, which is used in the same sense. *Luke* 16. 24. *Send* Lazarus *that he may dip the tip of his finger in Water*, &c. where the word is *bapse*, the Subjunctive Mood of *bapto*. John 13. 26. *He it is to whom I give a Sop, when I have dipped it: and when he had dipped it, he gave it to* Judas Iscariot, *the Son of* Simon. In the first Clause is used the Participle *bapsas*, from the Primitive *bapto:* in the second Clause is used the same, as in *Mat.* 26. 23. (to wit) the Participle *embapsas*. Rev. 19. 13. *Vesture dipt in Blood*; where the Participle of the Preter-perfect Tense of the Passive Voice is used (to wit) *bebammenon.*

(2.) It appears it is by dipping, in that there was choice made of a place where there was much Water, *John* 3. 23. *And* John *also was baptizing in* Enon, *for there was much Water.* If baptizing had been by any other way than by dipping, there had been no need to make choice of a place where there was much Water, a little Water would have served the turn, especially if it had been by sprinkling, as the manner of some is: I suppose the same reason may be render'd why *John* did baptize in *Jordan*; and the People came from all parts thither to be baptized, for there was much Water. Also *Mark* 1. 5. *John* baptized them in the River of *Jordan.* It's very strange that he should baptize them in the River, if he did it by sprinkling a little Water on the Face.

(3.) It

(3.) It appears it was by dipping, in that the Subject and the Administrator went both down into the Water, and then baptized, and after the Subject was baptized, they came both up out of the Water. Acts 8. 38, 39. *And he commanded the Chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the Water, both* Philip *and the* Eunuch; *and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the Water,* &c. Mat. 3. 16. *And Jesus when he was baptized, went straightway up out of the Water,* &c. But here it is objected, that the word that is translated *Acts* 8. 38. [*into*] is sometimes used for *to*, and not for *into*; it may signify either, and is used promiscuously for *to* or *into*; so that nothing may be concluded barely from the word. To this I answer; suppose this be granted, yet it follows not but that it may and ought to be taken here for *into*, as it is translated. For,

1. We see it was the Judgment of the Translators, that it ought to be so taken here, or else they would have translated it otherwise; I can't think they did it contrary to their Judgment.

2. The Text tells you, they came to the Water, antecedent to their going down into it: First, *They came unto a certain Water*, ver. 36. Did they draw back the Chariot, that they might come unto it a second time, and not go down into it at all?

3. It is observed, that the Greek word that is translated *unto*, is a different word from that which is translated *into*.

4. This word *into* is consonant with other Scriptures, where Baptism is the Point in hand; *Christ came up out of the Water*, and if so, he went first down into it. *John* baptized them in the River of *Jordan*; how could that be, unless they went down into the River? Again, it's observ'd, that the Greek Prepositions are used elsewhere in their proper sense for *into* and *out of*; Mat. 27. 53. *And came out of their Graves, and went into the holy City:* there it's observ'd, that the Preposition ἐκ *out of*, and εἰς *into*, are used in their proper sense. *John* 20. 27. ——*and thrust it into my side*; there the Preposition εἰς is used *into*. *Mat.* 16. 9. *Luke* 8. 2. —*out of whom he cast seven:* here in both these Texts ἀπὸ *out of* is used. Acts 16. 40. *And they went out*

of

of the Prison, and entered into the House of Lydia: where εἰς and εἰς are both used in one Verse, as well as in *Acts* 8. 38, 39. and certainly they were both in Prison and Water before they came out; here again these are borrowed Lines concerning the Greek words, as the former were, yet I suppose my Author hath not abused me in it.

(4.) It appears it is by Dipping, from the allusion it hath to a Burial; *We are buried with him by Baptism*, Col. 2. 12. A Person is not buried that hath only a little Dust or Earth sprinkled on his Face, but he is then buried when he is laid into the Earth, and covered all over. *Rom.* 6. 4. *We are buried with him by Baptism into death; that even as Christ was raised by the Glory of the Father, we also should walk in newness of Life.*

(5.) It appears it is by Dipping, in that the whole of the Subject is to be baptized, and not a part only; the Commission is to baptize the Person, the Face is no more mentioned than the Feet, nor is there any part mentioned but the whole; the word is, *baptizing them.* If it be objected, that the Face doth signify the Person; I answer, if that be granted, yet the Person doth not signify the Face: It's the Person that is to be baptized; but the sprinkling a little Water on the Face doth never wash the whole of the Subject; and this being done on the Face of a little Infant, is neither the *washing away the filth of the Flesh, nor yet the answer of a good Conscience, by the Resurrection of Christ:* there is neither the Figure, nor the thing figured.

2*dly*, It must be by Dipping in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: In these two the Form of the Ordinance doth consist.

Secondly, I shall prove the truth of the Point by Scripture. And here, first, I shall prove that Disciples are the Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission: And, secondly, That they are the only Subjects thereof.

First, That Disciples or Believers are the Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission. And here I need not multiply many Scriptures, tho it be a Point, the truth of which has been much opposed; the Truth of the Point lying so full and clear in the Text, which Text is the only

Commission that Ministers have to act by; and whatever Arguments are brought to prove, that such as are not discipled to Christ by the Word (that is, by actual Instruction) ought to be baptized, are all insignificant, unless they can prove it by this very Text: if their Commission do not warrant them to baptize such as are not discipled to Christ by the Word, there is no Text in all the New Testament that will warrant them so to do. By the Commission it is to disciple and baptize, yet I shall subjoin a few Scriptures for the Confirmation thereof. First, That Disciples are the Subjects of Baptism, *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved:* this is the same Commission; and here believing is to precede baptizing. Acts 2. 38. *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ.* If Repentance here be not to be taken for Faith, yet I am sure it can't be without Faith: For, first, there cannot be a true Godly Sorrow for crucifying the Son of God, without a true sight of a crucified Christ. Secondly, There can be no acceptance of what is done without Faith; *for without Faith it is impossible to please God.* Acts 8. 37. *If thou believest with all thy Heart, thou mayst*; that is, thou mayst be baptized.

Secondly, I shall prove it by Scripture Precedents: And here we have not one Precedent in all the Scripture of any one Person that ever was baptized, till such time as they did believe, or were discipled unto Christ by the Word. The first Precedent that I shall offer is, those that were baptized by Christ and *John*, they were Disciples; *John* 4. 1. *When the Lord knew that the Pharisees had heard, that Christ made and baptized more Disciples than* John, *&c.* Those that were baptized by *John*, who was the fore-runner of Christ, were first discipled; and those that were baptized by Christ when he came, were first discipled. The Apostles, who well understood their Lord's Commission, and who were injoyned by the same Commission to teach us to observe all things whatsoever Christ had commanded them, never baptized any but such as were first discipled to Christ by the Word; nor did they ever teach others to baptize any but Disciples; nor is there any Apostolical Doctrine, from whence such a Conse-

Consequence may be drawn, to warrant the baptizing of any but Disciples. *Acts* 2.41. then as many as *gladly received the Word, were baptized*; not one more: They are first discipled, and then baptized; here are no more baptized than are added to the Church: *The same day there were added unto them about three thousand Souls*; and no more added unto them than were admitted to all the Ordinances: *they continued in the Apostles Doctrine, and breaking of Bread, and in Prayer.* Acts 8. 12. *When they believed* Philip, *speaking of the things concerning the Kingdom of God, they were baptized, both Men and Women.* Acts 18. 8. *Then* Crispus *the chief Ruler of the Synagogue, believed in God, with all his House; and many of the Corinthians believed, and were baptized.* If whole Families believe, then whole Families are baptized; if but a part believe, then a part is baptized.

2. I shall prove, that Believers, or such as are discipled to Christ by the Word, are the only Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission: no other but Disciples, there are no other to be found in the Commission, therefore there are no other to be baptized by the Commission: *Acts* 8. 37. *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst.* The contrary is this, If thou dost not believe with all thy heart, thou mayst not: It had been altogether useless for *Philip* to have made him this Answer, if he might have been baptized while an Unbeliever. Luke 3. 7, 8. *Then said he to those that came out to be baptized of him, O Generation of Vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the Wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruit meet for Repentance, and begin not to say within your selves, We have* Abraham *to our Father.* These came forth to *John* to be baptized, and were put back, and yet he denies not but that they were the Children of *Abraham*, that was enough to privilege them to Circumcision, but not enough to Baptism. *John* did never put by Believers that came to be baptized by him; but if Unbelievers come to be baptized, they are put by; which shews plainly enough, that they are only Believers that are the Subjects of Baptism. If there be neither Precept nor Precedent in the Word for the baptizing of any but Believers, then are Believers the only Subjects of Baptism: but there is neither Precept nor

Precedent in the Word for the baptizing of any but Believers, therefore Believers are the only Subjects of Baptism. I think this to be as fully proved, as we can expect a Negative to be proved.

3. I shall answer the most material Objections that have or may be brought against this Truth.

Object. 1. Such as have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, have a right to Baptism: but Believers and their Children, have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace; therefore they have a right to Baptism. That they have all an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, the Children as well as the Parents, appears, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11. *You stand all of you this day before the Lord your God, your Captains of your Tribes, your Officers, with all the Men of* Israel; *your little ones, your Wives, with the stranger that is in your Camp, from the hewer of thy wood to the drawer of thy water; that thou shouldest enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, and into the Oath that the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day,* &c.

To this I answer; 1. I deny this Covenant to be the Covenant of Grace. 2. I deny the Subjects of this Covenant to be Believers considered as such. 3. I deny, that barely an Interest in this Covenant, or Covenant of Grace, is the ground of Baptism.

1. I deny this Covenant to be the Covenant of Grace; and it's enough for me to deny it, it lies on them that make the objection to make it good; yet I shall offer something of Reason for what I say: First, this Covenant is distinguished from the Covenant of Grace, *Jer.* 31. 31, 32. therefore it's not the same: *Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new Covenant with the house of* Israel, *and* Judah; *not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to lead them up out of the Land of* Egypt; *that which my Covenant they brake, although I was a Husband unto them.* That the new Covenant that the Lord promiseth to make is the Covenant of Grace, I think is denied by none; and that the Covenant (which is here distinguished from the New Covenant) that was made with their Fathers when God brought them up out of *Egypt*, was that same Co-

ven-

venant that God made with them, *Deut.* 29. 10. can rationally be denied by none; that it was the same Covenant that was made, *Deut.* 29. 10. appears by *ver.* 25. where the Reason of the Judgments that the Lord threatens to bring upon them, is assigned to their forsaking the Covenant that the Lord made with them, when he brought up out of the Land of *Egypt*, which was the same Covenant that was made in *ver.* 10, 11. Now the New Covenant, or the Covenant of Grace, is not according to this Covenant, it differs from it in many respects; some of which I shall here lay down.

First, The New Covenant is absolute, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. the Tenour of this Covenant is; I will, and they shall: *I will write my Law in their hearts; I will be their God, and they shall be my People; and they shall all know me, from the least to the greatest: for I will forgive their Iniquity, and remember their Sins no more.* This is the Covenant of Grace, and here is no Condition put into it, the performance of which doth intitle the Subjects unto the Blessings thereof.

But the Covenant that God made with them, *Deut.* 29. was a conditional Covenant, as appears *Deut.* 28. 1, 2. *If you will indeed obey my voice, and do all that I command you, then all these Blessings shall come unto you:* ver. 15. *But if you will not hearken unto me, to do all that I command you, then all these Curses shall come upon you, and overtake you,* &c. Now according to all these words in the 28*th Chap.* was *Moses* to make the Covenant with them in the 29*th*, as appears by the 1*st vers.* of the 29*th Chapter.*

Secondly, The Covenant of Grace is a better Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 6. He is a Mediator of a better Covenant, established on better Promises; God hath put Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification into the Covenant of Grace; that he will write his Law in their hearts, that he will be merciful to their Unrighteousness, and remember their Sins no more, *ver.* 10, 11.

But there is not one promise of Justification nor Sanctification put into this Covenant; if there had, this Covenant would have been good, and the Promises as good as the Covenant of Grace, or the Promises thereof. How could it

be otherwiſe, if the ſame Bleſſings had been put into this Covenant, as are put into the new Covenant? there is not the bleſſing of a new Heart, nor of the pardon of Sin to be found among all thoſe Bleſſings, *Deut.* 28. 2 to 15. and theſe were the Bleſſings of this Covenant.

Thirdly, There is not one Subject of the Covenant of Grace but is juſtified, and ſhall be ſanctified. *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. *I will write my Law in their hearts; they ſhall all know me from the leaſt to the greateſt: for I will forgive their Iniquity, and remember their Sin no more.* This remiſſion of Sin is applied to the time of Chriſt's Oblation, *Heb.* 10. 15, 16. the witneſs of the Spirit is there called in to atteſt that great Truth that is laid down in the 14*th ver.* that by one Oblation he hath for ever perfected (or pardoned) them that are ſanctified, whereof the Holy Ghoſt alſo is a witneſs; the witneſs that the Spirit bears is this; *Their Sins and Iniquities will I remember no more:* and from this teſtimony of the Spirit the Apoſtle draws this inference, That where remiſſion of theſe is, there is no more ſacrifice for ſin: but there were multitudes of thoſe that entred into Covenant with the Lord, *Deut.* 29. 10. that were never juſtified nor ſanctified. *Deut.* 29. 4. *God hath not given them a Heart to perceive, nor Eyes to ſee, nor Ears to hear unto this day.* Rom. 11. 7. *What then?* Iſrael *hath not obtained that which it ſought after; but the Election hath obtained it, and the reſt were blinded.* There were of the Non-elect in this Covenant that went without New Covenant-Bleſſings, *ver.* 8. *As it is written, God hath given them the ſpirit of ſlumber; Eyes that they ſhould not ſee, and Ears that they ſhould not hear.* This does not look like that promiſe that God hath made in the New Covenant to all the Subjects thereof, that they ſhall all know him, from the leaſt to the greateſt of them; that Covenant, the Subjects whereof, or part of the Subjects thereof, might go without Juſtification and Sanctification, was not the Covenant of Grace. But for this Covenant, many of the Subjects thereof might and did go without Juſtification and Sanctification; therefore it was not the Covenant of Grace. Some of them indeed were juſtified and ſanctified, but not by virtue of their Intereſt in this Covenant, but in

the

the Covenant of Grace: for all the Elect among the *Jews* had an Interest in the Covenant of Grace at the same time. These two Covenants were in being together.

Fourthly, The Covenant of Grace contains only Blessings, there is no Curse put into that Covenant, the sum and substance thereof is Blessedness. *Gen.* 22. 18. *In thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed.* All the Subjects of this Covenant are blessed, their Sins are all pardoned, and such are blessed ones: *Blessed is the man whose Iniquities are forgiven.* The Promises of this Covenant are full of Blessings, and there are none but Promises put into it, Promises of good to be bestowed on them, *Ezek.* 36. 26, 27. that God will withhold nothing that is good, *Psal.* 84. 11. that all things shall work together for good, *Rom.* 8. 28.

But this Covenant contains Curses as well as Blessings, *Deut.* 29. 21. *And the Lord shall separate him for evil, out of all the Tribes of* Israel, *according to all the Curses of the Covenant that are written in the Book of the Law.* The Curses that are contained in the 28*th chap.* from *ver.* 16 to the end, were the Curses of this Covenant; and these might fall on the Subjects thereof without a sanctified use of them, as they did on those that were compared to the evil Figs, *Jer.* 24. 8, 9, 10.

Fifthly, The Covenant of Grace is still in being, it's confirmed by Christ, and there is no disannulling it: He is still the Mediator of the new Covenant, *Heb.* 12. 24. therefore the new Covenant remains.

But this Covenant is done away, *Zec.* 11. 10. *Then I took my staff, even beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my Covenant that I had made with all the People, and it was broken in that day.* If this Covenant, that is here said to be made with all the People, was not the Covenant that was made with the whole Congregation of *Israel*, *Deut.* 29. then shew me what Covenant it was; shew me another Covenant if you can that was made with all the people of *Israel*, and that was broken by Christ, when he was offered up, when they weighed for his Price thirty pieces of Silver this Covenant being broken, it's evident it was not the Covenant of Grace.

2. I deny that they were all Believers that at this time were taken into Covenant with the Lord; therefore no argument can be drawn from it, to prove that Believers and their Children have intereſt in the Covenant of Grace. This was certainly a mix'd people, there were many among them that were vile and wicked. *Moſes* declares that *God had not given them Hearts to perceive, nor Eyes to ſee, nor Ears to hear unto this day.* Here were the blind and the deaf, and I may ſay the hard-hearted too; and this was the very day that they ſtood before the Lord, to enter into Covenant with him. Here were the ſtrangers that were in the Camp, as well as the *Iſraelites*, which ſtrangers I ſuppoſe were the *Egyptians:* for it's ſaid, *Exod.* 12. 38. that *a mixed multitude went up alſo.* Do theſe look like Believers, that have neither Eyes to ſee, nor Hearts to conſider? this was a brave Camp indeed, if they were all Believers, from the Hewer of their Wood to the Drawer of their Water. I wonder how Miniſters can look upon this to be the Covenant of Grace, that had ſuch a mix'd People to be the Subjects thereof; or upon theſe to be all Believers, or taken into Covenant under that Conſideration.

Object. But ſome may ſay, They did all believe with a dogmatical Faith, they did believe a *Meſſiah* to come.

To this I anſwer. 1. This is ſooner ſpoken than proved. It's a great queſtion, whether all the Camp had ſuch a Faith: But, 2. Would ſuch a Faith ſerve the turn? Would it be ſufficient to intereſt them and their Children in the Covenant of Grace? if it would, why will not the like dogmatical Faith ſerve now? and if it will, then it's eaſy to prove that almoſt all, if not every Engliſh-Man and his Children have an Intereſt therein. Where will you find an Engliſh-Man, tho never ſo profane and wicked, that does not as much believe that Chriſt is come, as the generality of the *Jews* did believe that he was to come? If this dogmatical Faith be the Faith that ſome intend, when they ſay that Believers and their Children have an intereſt in the Covenant, and a right to be baptized, why then do they exclude and put by the Children of any where this dogmatical Faith is to be found? There are many that do agree

from

from the same ground, that the Children of Believers have an Interest in the Covenant, and a right to Baptism, that yet will baptize none whose Parents are not true Believers in the Judgment of Charity.

3. I deny that barely an Interest either in this Covenant, or in the Covenant of Grace, was or is the ground of Baptism.

First, An Interest in this Covenant was not the ground of Baptism; those that came to *John* to be baptized, *Mat.* 3. 7. *Luke* 3. 7. and were denied, had an interest in this Covenant, they were the Children of *Abraham*, with whom this Covenant was originally made, *Gen.* 15. 18. which Covenant took in all the natural Seed, considered as such; and this Covenant remained in being till Christ was offered up, yet were these sent away not baptized. Had an Interest in this Covenant been the ground of Baptism, *John* would not have sent them away without it.

Secondly, I deny that barely an Interest in the Covenant of Grace is the ground of Baptism: where do the Scriptures say that such as have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, have have a Right to the Ordinance? For men to assert an interest in the Covenant of Grace to be that which gives a right to Baptism, and bring no Scripture to prove it, will go but a little way with those that make the Word their Rule in the matters of worship.

Thirdly, An Interest in the Covenant of Grace precedes Sanctification; a new Heart is an effect of this Interest, not the cause. Now this Interest is invisible; who can tell who they are that have an interest in the Covenant of Grace, till God change their hearts and lives by a work of Sanctification? but the ground of Baptism must be visible.

Object. 2. If Believers and their Children have an Interest in the Promise, then they have a right to Baptism: but Believers and their Children have an interest in the Promise; therefore they have a right to Baptism. *Acts* 2. 38, 39. *Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the Promise is to you, and to your Children.*

To this I answer. (1.) I deny the Subjects here to be Believers at the time when the Apostle said, the Promise is to

you

you and to your Children; and no Argument can be drawn to prove a Privilege to Believers and their Seed, from what is spoken to Unbelievers. That they were not Believers may appear,

1. In that they were but under some Conviction, they were pricked at the heart, that's all the account we have of them: but Conviction and Conversion are two things; a person may be convicted that is not converted; nay, he must be convicted before he can be converted: the whole need not the Physician, but they that are sick.

2. They were ignorant of the way of Salvation, and that a Person can't be that does believe: for Faith is as well the act of the Understanding, as of the Will; their ignorance of the way of Salvation appears in that they cried out, *Men and Brethren, what shall we do?*

3. It appears in that they were with many other words exhorted to save themselves from that untoward Generation; that is, as I apprehend, from the Judgments that hung over the heads of that untoward Generation for rejecting of Christ: but if they had believed, they had been saved already, there had then been no need of that exhortation.

4. They did not all believe at last, *ver.* 41. *Then they that gladly received the Word, were baptized*, &c. There were but a part of them that did embrace this exhortation.

(2.) I deny that by the word *unto*, is intended Interest in the Promise; they had indeed the Promise, but the Offer is one thing, and Interest is another.

1st. God did never vouchsafe this Privilege of Interest in the Promise to the Children of the dearest of his Servants, considered as such, not to the Children of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*. *Rom.* 9. 6. *All are not* Israel *that are of* Israel; then all that were of *Israel*, had not an interest in the Promise: for the Promises were made to none but *Israel* (*Jer.* 31. 33.) *ver.* 7. neither because they are the Seed of *Abraham* are they all Children, *But in* Isaac *shall thy Seed be called:* ver. 8. so then they that are the Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God; but the Children of the Promise are accounted for the Seed; that is, the Seed with whom God did establish his Covenant, *Gen.*

17.

17. 7. Here were some of the Seed of *Abraham*, which were the Children of the Flesh, that were not the Children of God, nor the Children of the Promise, nor accounted for the Seed. *Ver.* 11. Jacob *have I loved, and* Esau *have I hated*; and yet *Esau* was the Son of *Isaac*, his first born. Now can it be supposed, that a Person hated of God had an Interest in the Promise?

2*ly*. Such as have an interest in the Promise, shall certainly injoy the good and benefit thereof, Justification, and Sanctification, and Glorification. *Rom.*9.6. It cannot be that the word of God has taken none effect: and if so, then it cannot be that such as have an Interest in the Promise should go without one or all of these Blessings, for they are the effect of the Promise. There are none will say that all the Children of Believers shall be saved, and yet they cannot miss of Salvation if they have an Interest in the Promise.

3*ly*. Once an Interest in the Promise, and for ever an Interest in the Promise. Jer. 32. 40. *I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them, to do them good; and I will put my fear in their Hearts, that they shall not depart from me.* God covenants here for himself and them too; for himself, *that he will never turn away from them, to do them good*; for them, *that he will put his fear in their Hearts, that they shall not depart from him.* And here I should think that none, that deny falling from Grace, should oppose me in this.

(3.) I deny that the offer of the Promise is the ground of Baptism; those that did not receive the Word had the offer of the Promise, as well as those that did: where-ever the Gospel comes, there comes the offer of the Promise; it's not the offer of the Promise, but the Command, *Repent and be baptized*, that's the Ground; the offer of the Promise is a Motive to inforce the Exhortation. If the Question then be, What must those do to whom the Promise is? the Answer will be this, *Repent, and be baptized.* Repentance must come between the offer of the Promise, and the taking up of the Ordinance. But here it may be objected, that Repentance is injoined the Parent, not the Child. I answer,

anſwer, that Baptiſm alſo is injoined the Parent, not the Child; there are no more required to be baptized, than are required to repent antecedently thereunto.

Object. 3. If the Children of Believers are federally holy, then they have a right to Baptiſm; but they are ſo. 1 Cor. 7. 14. *For the unbelieving Husband is ſanctified in the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is ſanctified in* or *to the Husband; elſe were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.* To this I anſwer:

1. Theſe three Objections are but one in ſubſtance, tho they vary in terms; for, to have an Intereſt in the Covenant, an Intereſt in the Promiſe, and to be federally holy, is the ſame thing. If neither of the two former Objections will ſtand, then the third will not ſtand, for they are all built on the ſame foundation; and it appears by the Anſwers given already, that it is but a ſandy Foundation that they are built upon.

2. Tho one of the Parents to whom the Apoſtle wrote was a Believer when he wrote to them, yet they were not ſo to be conſidered in their being ſanctified each to the other, but as Husband and Wife. There was a Caſe of Conſcience ſent to the Apoſtle for Reſolution, whether it was lawful for the Believer to abide with his or her unbelieving Yoke-fellow? this he anſwers in the Affirmative; but withal tells them, *ver.* 12. *To this ſpeak I, not the Lord.* Therefore it was neceſſary to demonſtrate it; and here, firſt, he profeſſes the lawfulneſs of their Continuance by the lawfulneſs of their State: *The unbelieving Husband is ſanctified in,* or *to the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is ſanctified in,* or *to the Husband*; that is, by the Ordinance of God, when both were Unbelievers, according to that Scripture, *Heb.* 13. 5. *Marriage is honourable among all, and the Bed undefiled:* Be they who they will, Believers or Unbelievers, they did not live in Fornication; but in Wedlock they were Husband and Wife, and ſo were ſeparated from all others to the lawful uſe of each others Bodys. Their Cohabitation was lawful according to the Word of God, and in this ſenſe the word *ſanctified* is taken elſewhere (for that which is lawful) 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. *Every Creature of God is good, and nothing to*

be

be refused; for it is sanctified by the Word of God, &c that is, lawful to be used; they were married, and so were sanctified each to the other; this he illustrates by an Argument drawn from their Offspring, *Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*. If they had not been married, and so sanctified each to the other by the Ordinance of God, their children had been unclean, they had been illegetimate, unlawfully begotten. The word *unclean* is elsewhere taken for that which is unlawful, *Act.* 10, 14, *Not so Lord*; for, *I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean*; nothing that is forbidden by the Word; for the unclean Meats were no otherwise unclean, than as they were forbidden: *Rom.* 14. 14. *I know I am perswaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean in it self*. There is no inherent Uncleanness in those Creatures, but they are clean or unclean, as they are lawful or lawful according to the Word of God, and in this sense I take the Uncleanness and Holiness of the Children; they are not illegetimate, but lawfully begotten.

2. I deny the Holiness of the Children here to be federal Holiness. For,

(1.) The Holiness of the Child doth not arise from the Faith of the believing Parent, but from the Sanctification of the unbelieving, whose Sanctification did not arise from the Faith of his Yoke-fellow, but from the Ordinance of God when both were believers. Now there is nobody doth account the Sanctification of the Unbeliever to be fedral-Holiness; and if that be not fedral Holiness, then the Holiness of the Child can't be fedral; for that's the Root from whence the Holiness of the Child doth spring; Now such as the Root is, such are the Branches; such as the Fountain, such are the Streams; the Effect can't rise higher than the Cause. The Holiness of the Child springing from the Sanctification of the unbelieving Parent, must necessarily be of the same kind.

(2.) The Apostle speaks here of their Children indefinitely, such as were born when both were Unbelievers, as well as those that were born after one of the Parents did believe (some of which, for ought we know, remained profest Pagans,

Pagans, as well as one of the Parents, and yet holy.) *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.* The Holiness of the Child did not depend on the Faith of the Parent, nor is there a word spoken of the Faith of the Believer in the Text, as if that were the ground, either of the Sanctification of the Unbeliever, or of the Holiness of the Child.

3. I deny federal Holiness to be the ground of Baptism.

(1.) The Scripture doth no where make it the ground of Baptism, neither directly, nor consequentially; if it doth, produce it: we may not run hand over head, and say this is the ground, and the other thing is the ground, when we have no ground in Scripture for what we say.

(2.) It's very apparent from the Word, that federal Holiness was not the ground of Baptism; all the *Jews* were federally holy when Christ and *John* baptized, yet they were made Disciples before they were baptized, and so not baptized as considered federally holy, but as disciples of Christ, *John.* 4. 1. They that came to *John* to be baptized, *Matt.* 3. 7. were federally holy, and did in effect plead their federal Holiness as the ground of their Claim to Baptism, they pleaded that they were the Children of *Abraham*; now the Children of *Abraham* were federally holy, considered as such, they were born interested in that Covenant, that peculiar Covenant, by virtue of which the were federally holy, a separate People. Had their federal Holiness been questioned, they could have produced the token of the Covenant in the foreskin of their Flesh, and yet these were denied, the Ordinance notwithstanding the Plea. That they were denied, may appear,

1. In that he calls them a generation of Vipers; who, can think that he would have branded them with so black a Mark, and afterwards baptize them? Would all the Water in *Jordan* have washed it off again? Was Baptism an Ordinance appointed for Viperous Brood?

2. He overrules their Plea: *Think not to say within your selves, We have* Abraham *to our Father.* He doth not deny their relation to *Abraham*, but rejects their Plea: Birth Priviledge did never intitle to Baptism; no Instance can be given thereof.

3. He

3. He counsels them to take another course; *Bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance:* this Counsel was rejected by them; and so they go without the Ordinance. *Luke 7. 30. But the Pharisees and the Lawyers rejected the Counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized by him*; that is, by *John*. Had federal Holiness been the ground of Baptism, *John* would have baptized them as well as others.

Object. 4. If the Children of Believers are Disciples, then they have a right to Baptism, according to Christ's Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go disciple to me all Nations, baptizing them*, &c. But the Children of Believers are Disciples, therefore they have a right to Baptism. Acts 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God to lay a yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples, which neither we nor our Fathers were ever able to bear?* This Yoke was Circumcision after the manner of *Moses*, and that was for Children of eight days old, therefore Children of eight days old are Disciples, and so ought to be baptized.

To this I answer: 1. I grant the *major* Proposition, That such as are discipled to Christ by the Word, have a right to Baptism.

2. I deny the *minor*, That Children of eight days old are Disciples, or that they are intended or comprehended in the word *Disciples*, *Acts* 15. 10. it was the Brethren only on whom they would have laid the Yoke, not a word of Children in the whole Controversy; *ver.* 1. *They taught the Brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of* Moses, *ye cannot be saved.* They did not teach the Children, nor did they teach the Brethren to circumcise their Children, it was not come so far as yet: the manner of *Moses* here did not respect the Subject but the Form; it was the Brethren that must be circumcised, but how? after the manner of *Moses:* The word *ye* is relative to the Brethren; had Children of eight days old been the Antecedent, it had been something to the purpose; but it's the Brethren, among whom Children of eight days old could not be numbered: For, 1. They were such as had received the Holy Ghost, *ver.* 8. 2. They had purified their Hearts by Faith, *ver.* 9. 3. They were such, who from among the Gentiles were turned unto God, *ver.* 19.

2*dly.* By

2*dly*. By the Yoke here we are not to understand Circumcision barely considered, but Circumcision binding them to keep the Law in point of Justification, *ver*. 5. this was the Yoke that neither they nor their Fathers were ever able to bear; Circumcision barely considered, Children of eight days old were able to bear, and did. Now tho Circumcision might have been imposed on the Children, yet the false Doctrine, which was that wherein this intolerable Yoke did consist, could not, for Children are as incapable of receiving a Lie, as they are of receiving the Truth.

3*dly*. A Disciple is a Scholar, one that learns; but Children that are incapable of learning, are incapable of being discipled.

Object. But some may say, that a Child is a Scholar the first day he goes to School.

To this I answer; 1. If this were granted, yet it would not follow, that he is a Scholar before he goes to School. Now the Children of Believers, while in an Infant-state, are not gone so far, they are not entred in Christ's School: pray shew me where Christ hath set up a School for teaching Infants in an Infant-state; Who is the School-master that Christ hath appointed to teach and instruct them? and where is this teaching restrained to the Children of Believers? for if there be such a School, and it be not restrained to the Children of Believers, then the Children of Unbelievers are Disciples as well as the Children of Believers, and so a right to Baptism may be claimed for them too.

2. I grant that in some sense a Child may be said to be a Scholar the first day he goes to School, according to the common acceptation, provided he has learned something; but if he has learned nothing, I will not say he is a poor Scholar, for properly he is none at all.

3. It is not enough to denominate a Person a Disciple of Christ, that he is in Christ's School, and under the teachings of such as are appointed by Christ to go and disciple to him; no, tho he hath freely and voluntarily submitted himself to be taught by them: the Eunuch had freely submitted himself to *Philip*, to be taught by him; *Acts* 8. 31. Philip *answered his desire, he went up into the Chariot and preached Christ*

Christ to him: but when he desired to be baptized, *Philip* takes an account of him, whether he had learned Christ, before he could conclude him a Disciple of Christ, *ver.* 37, 38. from whence it does plainly appear, that a Disciple of Christ is one that hath not only been under the teachings of Christ, but hath also learned Christ by the Word that he hath been taught.

4. A Disciple of Christ is one that hath so learned Christ as to deny himself for Christ. *Luke* 14. 26. *Except a man hate Father and Mother, yea and his own Life also, he cannot be my Disciple.* Children then that are incapable of learning Christ, so as to deny themselves for Christ, are incapable of being discipled unto Christ.

Object. 5. Such as are Church-members have a right to baptism; but the Children of Believers are Church-members, therefore they have a right to Baptism. That Children are Church-members, appears, *Rom.*11. 17. when some of the Branches were broken off, through unbelief, the *Gentiles* were grafted in in their room, and did partake with those that remained of the root and fatness of the Olive-tree. Now when the *Gentiles* were grafted in, their Children were grafted in with them; *ver.* 16. *If the root be holy, the branches also are holy.* When the natural Branches were broken off, they and their Children were broken off together: so when the *Gentiles* were grafted in, they and their Children were grafted in together.

To this I answer; 1. I deny that the *Gentiles* were grafted in among the *Jews*, as they were counted a National Church, tho I grant that they were grafted in among them as they were considered the universal visible Church. The Constitution of the Church was altered from National to Congregational. As soon as Christ was offered up, their Tabernacle fell, their Priesthood fell, their national Ordinances alter; Tabernacles, and their national Church-officers were all down. *Jerusalem* and *Judea*, and all the Regions round about were but one Church before; but now those of them that did embrace Jesus Christ, were imbodied into particular Congregations. There were a plurality of Churches in *Judea:*

I *was unknown by face*, saith the Apostle, *unto the Churches of Judea*, *Gal.* 1. 22.

2. I deny that the Children of the *Jews* were broken off, together with their Parents: if an unbelieving *Jew* had a Child that did believe, that believing Child was not broken off with the unbelieving Father; the Child stood a Branch upon the Root when the Father was gone.

3. I deny that there were more of the *Gentiles* grafted in than did believe: it were strange that the natural Branches should be broken off because of Unbelief, and that unbelieving *Gentiles* should be grafted in. What difference is there between an unbelieving *Jew*, and an unbelieving *Gentile*, that the one must be accounted a Church-member, and not the other? That there were none but Believers grafted in is evident, for they had their standing by faith; *ver.* 20. *They were broken off through Unbelief, and thou standest by Faith.*

4. I deny that the believing *Gentile* is the Root, he himself is but a Branch; the Root and the Branch are two things, ver. 15. *Thou bearest not the Root, but the Root thee.*

5. I deny that the Children of the *Gentiles* are the holy Branches, *ver.* 16. they are the natural Branches that are the holy Branches, the Children of the *Jews*, and not the Children of the *Gentiles*: *ver.* 15. *for if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall their receiving be but life from the dead?* that is, the *Jews*. Here is an intimation of their return, that God will have a time to call them again, and renders this as the Reason, ver. 16. *For if the Root be holy, so are the Branches.* This respects the Children of the *Jews*, not considered as such, but such of them as shall in time believe, and so be grafted in again, *ver.* 23. *and they also if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in again, for God is able to graft them in.* There is no foundation in this *Chapter* for Childrens Church-membership. That Children are not Church-members, will farther appear, if we consider the matter of a Gospel-Church.

1. They are not Members of a particular instituted Church; the matter of such a Church is visible Saints, such as are inherently

herently holy in the Judgment of Charity. This appears, first, by the Titles that are given them in the Epistles that were sent to them, they are stiled Saints, such as were sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be Saints, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. The Church of the *Thessalonians* are stiled, *Such as were in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ*, 1 Thess. 1. 1. Secondly, it appears by the improvement that is made by each individual Member; *Your Faith groweth exceedingly, and the love of every one of you aboundeth one towards another*, 2 Thess. 1. 3. This is not applicable to Children in an Infant-state, and yet it's applicable to the whole Church, not only as it's collectively considered, but as it's distributively considered. *Phil.* 1. 6. *I am perswaded that he that hath begun a good work in you, will not cease to perfect the same unto the coming of Christ, as it is meet for me to think so of you all.*

2. They are not Members of the universal visible Church, that also is made up of visible Saints: 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *By one Spirit are ye all baptized into one Body, and made to drink into one Spirit, whether* Jew *or* Gentile. A Jew that before was born a Church-member, is not now to be owned as such, unless in the Judgment of Charity he be new-born. *Eph.* 4. 4. *There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your Calling: one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all. And to every one of us is given Grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.* This one Body is the universal, visible Church, and it's made up of such as are called in one hope of their Calling, and each individual Member hath in the Judgment of Charity a measure of Grace; here is then no room for Children to stand Members, that are not called in this one Hope, that have not as yet a measure of Grace bestowed on them.

Object. But some may say, The Children of Believers were Church-members under the legal Dispensation.

To this I answer: *First*, The Question is not what they were, but what they are; the Children of Unbelievers were then Church-members, as well as Believers: all the Children of the *Jews* were Church-members, and we must bewray our ignorance if we will say that all the *Jews* were Believers:

Unbelievers were then Church-members as well as Believers. *You believe not*, saith Christ, *because ye are not my Sheep, as I said unto you*; and yet they were Church-members. Will you argue, that the Children of such who do not believe are Church-members now, or that such as do not believe, are now Church-members because they were such then?

Secondly, The Constitution of the Church is now altered (as I said before) from national to congregational, the matter whereof is visible Saints, and the form mutual Consent; neither of which are Children in an Infant-state capable of.

Thirdly, We may not now take our measures from the rules of that Dispensation any more for Members than for Ordinances, and for Officers, the Laws of the Dispensation being changed: there being a change of the Priesthood, there is made also of necessity a change of the Law, *Heb.* 7. 12.

Fourthly. I deny Church-membership to be the ground of Baptism; that is, that Church-membership which Children once had; or that any Person that stood a Member of that Church-state, was ever baptized, considered as such: the *Pharisees* that came to *John* to be baptized, and were denied, *Mat.* 3. 7. were Church-members.

The Partition-wall was not then broken down, the national Constitution was not then changed; all the *Jews* were Church-members when Christ and *John* baptized, yet they were not baptized considered as such, but as discipled unto Christ, *John* 4. 1.

Baptism is administred antecedent to our being formed Members of a particular instituted Church, *Acts* 2. 41. they were first discipled; secondly baptized; thirdly added unto the Church; therefore Membership in a particular Church can't be the ground thereof, because it's subsequent thereunto: and tho it be granted that the Subjects of Baptism are Members of the universal visible Church, as being discipled unto Christ; yet it is upon the profession of their faith that they were and still ought to be baptized, and under no other Consideration. *Acts* 8. 38. *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst.*

Object.

Object. 6. If Baptism came in the room of Circumcision, then Children may and ought to be baptized: but Baptism came in the room of Circumcision; therefore Children may and ought to be baptized. That Baptism came in the room of Circumcision, appears, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. they are there put one for another.

To this I answer. 1. I deny that Baptism came in the room of Circumcision. If Baptism and Circumcision stood together several years by the Ordinance of God, then Baptism did not come in the room of Circumcision: but Baptism and Circumcision stood together several years by the Ordinance of God; therefore Baptism did not come in the room of Circumcision. Circumcision stood of divine appointment till Christ was offered up. If a *Jew* had been discipled to Christ, and baptized, and the next day made Father of a Son of eight days old, that Son must have been circumcised, or he had broken the Covenant: but God sent *John* to baptize; and Christ himself did baptize by his Disciples long before he was offered up.

2. Circumcision belonged only to the Male, not to the Female; but Baptism belongs to the Female as well as the Male. Did the Baptism of the Female come in the room of Circumcision, when Circumcision had never any place with the Female? or can the Baptism of the Female be argued from the Circumcision of the Male? Is there any room to form an Argument here, if it were granted that they came one in the room of another?

3. Circumcision was to be administred the eighth day, not sooner nor later; how comes it about that there is now no precise time for a Child to be baptized in, if Baptism came in the room of Circumcision? Where did God ever declare that Baptism should be administred in the room of Circumcision? But he would no longer tie you to an exact day or time; as for that you should take your own time.

4. The Subjects treated of, *Col.* 2. were Believers every one of them, they had received Christ Jesus, *ver.* 6. they were compleat in Christ, *ver.* 10.

5. It's spiritual Circumcision that is there mentioned, *ver.* 11. that which is made without hands, in putting off

the body of the Sins of the Flesh by the Circumcision of Christ.

6. It is not spiritual, but outward Baptism that is intended in the 12*th verf. Buried with him in Baptism*, that is, Water-Baptism. Now how inconsiderately do Men argue, when they say that Baptism and Circumcision are put one for the other, when the one is spiritual, and the other outward? If you say that Baptism is here to be taken of spiritual Baptism, and so they are put one for another: I answer (if this be granted) this is foren from the Case in hand: the Question is, Whether Circumcision and Baptism, as they are considered the Ordinances of God, and outwardly to be administred, are here put one for the other? and that they are not, is so plain and clear, that he that runs may read; there is then no ground from this Text to say that Baptism came in the room of Circumcision, nor is there another Text to be found from whence such a Conclusion may be drawn.

Object. 7. If Children be capable of the Kingdom of God, and the Blessing of Christ, which are the greater, then they are capable of Baptism, which is the lesser: But Children are capable of the Kingdom of God, and of the Blessing of Christ, that is the greater; therefore they are capable of Baptism, which is the lesser.

That they are capable of the greater, appears in that Christ saith, *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God; and he took them in his Arms and blessed them.*

To this I answer: It does not follow that they are capable of the lesser, tho it be granted that they are capable of the greater. The Supper of the Lord may be called the lesser, as well as Baptism: but Children that are capable of the Kingdom of God, and the Blessing of Christ, which is the greater, are not capable of the Supper of the Lord, which is the lesser; and yet there is no more required as a Prequalification to the Supper of the Lord than there is to Baptism.

Object. 8. Children are as capable now of Baptism, as they were formerly of Circumcision; and why then should they be denied?

To

To this I anſwer: I do not diſpute their Capacity, but the Authority thereof; there was a Command for that, *Gen.* 17. 10, 11. ſhew me the like Command for this, and I will yield the point. *Abraham* did not circumciſe his *Iſhmael* at eight days old, becauſe there was no Command for it; nor would he have circumciſed his *Iſaac* at eight days old if he had not had a Command ſo to do. Either Believers are commanded to baptize their Children, or they are not; if they are, produce it; if they are not, then there is no ſuch thing as Infant-Baptiſm of Divine Inſtitution. If the Duty of baptizing Children in an Infant-ſtate do not lie on the believing Parent, then I would fain know on whom it doth lie: I can't think that it lies on the Child while in an Infant-ſtate; the Child in an Infant-ſtate is neither capable of knowing what is matter of Duty, nor yet of doing: Nor doth it lie on the Miniſter; for, firſt, the Miniſter hath no Power to baptize the Child if the Parent refuſe to have it done. Secondly, He hath no Commiſſion ſo to do in caſe the Parent do conſent to it. They are Diſciples only that are put into his Commiſſion; but the Children of Believers are not diſcipled in an Infant-ſtate, therefore they are not put into his Commiſſion. Where ſhall we find on whom the Duty of Infant-Baptiſm is incumbent, if there be any ſuch thing? Precepts do not leave us at a loſs who it is they bind to that Duty.

Object. 9. We read of whole Houſes that were baptized, and it's probable that there were Children in ſome or all of them.

To this I anſwer: 1. If it be probable, yet it is not certain, and therefore no Argument can be drawn from it: could it be proved that there had been Children there, then there would have been ſome room for an Argument; but that can't be done.

2. It's more probable that there were no Children there, in that there are but four Houſholds mentioned among ſo many thouſands that were baptized, and were all known to be Believers. This affords a ſtrong Preſumption, that the Apoſtle did not baptize the Houſhold upon the Faith of the Parent; if he had, there would have been multitudes

of Houſholds that would have been baptized, if it had been common to baptize whole Houſholds: I ſee no reaſon why theſe four ſhould be mentioned more than others.

3. The Jailor believ'd in God with all his Houſe, *Acts* 16. 34. and *Criſpus*, the chief Ruler of the Synagogue, believ'd in God with all his Houſe, *Acts* 18. 8. Here are two of the four Houſes that were all Believers, here are no Children in theſe, for Children are not capable of Faith; *Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God:* but Children in an Infant-ſtate are not capable of hearing ſo as to underſtand, and to believe. *Stephanus* and his Houſe are ſaid to be the firſt Fruits of *Acaia*, and that they had addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints, which is tantamount to believing. Here are three of the four Houſholds that had no Children; and as for *Lydia*, no body knows whether ſhe was a Maid, Wife, or Widow: We read of the Brethren that were in her Houſe, but we read nothing of Children there, *Acts* 16. *ult.*

Object. 10. But if Children be denied Church-membership and Baptiſm under the Goſpel, that were admitted to Church-membership and Circumciſion under the Law; then Children are loſers by the coming of Chriſt in reſpect of outward Privileges.

To this I anſwer. 1. If this be granted, where ſhall the blame be laid? It was the Pleaſure of God under the Legal Adminiſtration that Children ſhould enjoy theſe Privileges; and it's the Pleaſure of God under the Evangelical Adminiſtration, that they ſhould not enjoy them. Men that were known after the Fleſh before Chriſt came, were no longer known after the Fleſh when Chriſt was offered up, Birth-Privileges were utterly ceas'd, 2 *Cor.* 5. 16. The Apoſtle ſtops the mouth of all Objections in this matter, by letting us know that *all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himſelf by Jeſus Chriſt.*

2. If there muſt be no alteration under the Goſpel of what there was under the Law, what then do you allow your Children in the room of the Paſſover, which then they had a right to? there was a Lamb appointed for a Houſe, Children were a part of the Houſe, and we can prove that there

were

were Children in those Houses where the Passover was eaten. Why do ye not plead for the Supper for your Children in the room of the Passover, as well as for Baptism in the room of Circumcision? you have as much ground to plead for the one as for the other. And what have we in the room of the Feast of First-fruits, and of the Feast of Ingatherings? shall we say that we are losers by the coming of Christ in respect of outward Privileges, because we have nothing in the room of these Feasts?

Object. II. But we are to teach all Nations, and to baptize them; Children are a part of a Nation, therefore they must be baptized.

To this I answer: 1. Turk and Pope are parts of a Nation, tho not both of the same Nation, and so are all the Pagans and Heathens in the World; must all these be baptized because they are part of a Nation?

2. Tho Children are part of a Nation, yet they are not part of a discipled Nation, they themselves being not discipled to Christ; the word *them* is relative to all Nations so and so modified and qualified; it is not all Nations considered as such, but all Nations discipled to Christ that ought to be baptized.

III. I shall give one Reason of the Point, why Believers, or such as are discipled to Christ by the Word, are the only Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission, and that is, because such only are put into the Commission; these are to be found there, and there are none but these to be found there. Ministers must keep close to their Commission, and if they do, they will find that there are no more to be baptized by them than are discipled unto Christ.

IV. I shall make some Application of the Point.

And first, By way of Information: Is it so that Believers, or such as are discipled to Christ by the Word, are the only Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission?

Then, 1*st*. It may inform us, that Ministers have sufficient Authority to disciple to Christ by the Word, and to baptize such as are discipled: That if the Question be, By what Authority they do these things, and who gave them this Authority? they have their Answer ready at hand, they have

have it from Christ; they have it not of Man, nor from Man; they have it not from the Magistrate, nor from Ministers that were before them; nor yet from any Church or Churches, but from Christ. That they have sufficient Authority for what they do of this kind, will appear in a few Particulars.

1. They have a Commission from Christ for what they do, and that under the broad Seal of Heaven: Christ came and spake unto them, and said, *Go, teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* They are sent by Christ, and have their Work assign'd them by Christ; they have their Commission to show for what they do. The Baptism of Disciples is not of Men, but of God, their Commission is from him who is God as well as Man.

2. Jesus Christ had Authority to give them this Commission, and he declared his Authority before he gave it, *Mat.* 28. 18. *All Power is given unto me both in Heaven and in Earth.*

3. Christ had his Authority from the Father, who is the Lord of the whole Earth, in whom all Power is originally vested by right of Creation. John 5. 22, 23. *The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Power unto the Son: That all Men might honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.*

2*dly.* It may inform us what the use and benefit of Baptism is that a Believer may expect in taking up of the Ordinance.

1. It is an obliging Ordinance; it binds the Soul to die to Sin, and live unto Holiness: *Rom.* 6. 2, 3, 4, 5. *How shall we that are dead to Sin, live any longer therein? Know you not, that as many of us as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his Death? Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism into Death; that even as Christ was raised by the Glory of the Father, we also should walk in newness of Life. We are buried with him by Baptism into Death*; that as the Body that is buried in the Grave lies rotting and consuming away, so the body of Sin should waste and consume away.

2. It's a confirming Ordinance, it's of use to confirm our Faith

Faith in the remiſſion of Sin by the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt. Acts 2. 38. *Repent, and be baptized for the remiſſion of Sin*, &c. Baptiſm doth not remit Sin, but it's a figure of that Blood by which the guilt of Sin is waſh'd away: it's an Evidence together with Faith of our Title to Salvation. *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved.* It's no Evidence by it ſelf, but together with Faith it is, as it's taken up in Obedience to the Will of God; without Faith it's of no uſe at all, and therefore there is no reaſon to contend for it for ſuch as do not believe; but together with Faith it's of great uſe.

Secondly, I would make uſe of it by way of Caution; firſt to Miniſters, and ſecondly to People.

Firſt, To Miniſters, and that in two Branches:

1. To beware they do not miſtake the Subject of Baptiſm, and ſo adminiſter the Ordinance to thoſe that have no right to it. I ſhall here propoſe a few things to be conſidered.

(1.) There are a great many Miniſters that are miſtaken (I mean ſuch as are for Infant-Baptiſm) I do not lay down this upon a bare Conjecture, but upon certain knowledg: Miniſters are divided into four Parties about the Subjects; tho they are all for baptizing of Children, yet not for the baptizing of all Children; and three of theſe Parties are miſtaken, which is ground enough to put the fourth upon a further ſearch and inquiry: for tho they ſeem to be all confident that Children are the Subjects according to the Rule, yet they are greatly divided whoſe Children they are that are the right Subjects according to the Rule; ſome will baptize all Children whoſe Parents make a verbal Profeſſion of Chriſt, tho their Converſation do utterly deſtroy their Profeſſion; a ſecond ſort will baptize all except Baſtards: A third ſort will baptize none but ſuch whoſe Parents are true Believers in the Judgment of Charity: A fourth ſort will baptize none but ſuch whoſe Parents, one or both, are in Communion with themſelves. Here are four Opinions, and there is but one Truth, therefore three of theſe muſt needs err, either they are too large, or too ſhort in their Judgment; and I do not in the leaſt queſtion but the fourth

is

is in an Error alſo; he that is moſt ſtrict in the Point of Infant-Baptiſm is too large, there being neither Precept nor Precedent for his Practice.

(2.) Conſider, if you baptize a wrong Subject, you do it in your own Name, not in the Name of Chriſt; my meaning is, you do it by your own Authority, not by the Authority of Chriſt, having no Commiſſion from him for what you do.

(3.) Conſider, it's a bold attempt for Miniſters to ſay, I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, if the Subject be not a Diſciple of Chriſt: This is like ſetting the broad Seal of Heaven to a Patent of their own drawing up.

(4.) Miniſters muſt give an account of their Stewardſhip another day: *The Books ſhall be opened, and every Man ſhall be judged out of the things that are written in the Books, according as his Works have been*; Rev. 20. 11. Then the Commiſſion will be laid open once more, and Miniſters muſt be tried whether they have obſerved Chriſt's order, firſt to diſciple, and then to baptize.

2. I would caution Miniſters to beware they do not miſtake the form of Adminiſtration, and make uſe of ſprinkling inſtead of dipping.

1ſt. Conſider there are a great many Miniſters that do either miſtake, or alter and change the form; ſome there are that do grant that the word in the Commiſſion ſignifies to dip, and that it was the Primitive Practice that Chriſt and *John* did baptize by Dipping, that yet make uſe of Sprinkling inſtead of Dipping, becauſe we are under a cold Climate, and alledg this for their Practice, That God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice: and that where moral Precepts and poſitive Precepts do interfere, there poſitive Precepts muſt give place; as when *David* eat of the Shew-bread, and the Diſciples pluck'd the Ears of Corn upon the Sabbath-day.

To this I anſwer: 1. Such as do think it good to alter the form of Baptiſm from Dipping to Sprinkling under this Conſideration, had beſt to conſider whether it were not neceſſary to alter their form of words too, and ſay, I

rantize

rantize thee, inſtead of I baptize thee; that ſo they may ſpeak truth in what they ſay, ſeeing they do it in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.

2. If the coldneſs of the Climate be ſuch that it will not admit of dipping, why do you do any thing in the room thereof? Where is your Authority for that? you are to baptize if you do any thing, it's not left to your diſcretion which of theſe ſhall be done by you: this is to rantize in your own Name.

3. I grant that in ſome caſes poſitive Precepts have given place when they have interfer'd with moral; but this is no where made a general Rule; for ſometimes moral Precepts have given place to poſitive, as when God commanded *Abraham* to offer up his Son *Iſaac* a Burnt-offering, the moral Precept, *Thou ſhalt not kill*, gave place to the poſitive.

4. When poſitive Precepts have given place to moral, it hath been in ſome caſe of exigency that hath ſuddenly fallen out, where in a little time the Subject might return to his Duty, unto the poſitive Precept again: but if the poſitive Precept to Dip muſt give place to the moral, becauſe of the coldneſs of the Climate, we ſhall never have opportunity to return to our Duty to the poſitive Precept more, becauſe our Climate will never alter; it will be always cold, and ſo the poſitive Precept to Dip, will be of no more uſe to us, than the Altar that was built on the other ſide of *Jordan* was to them, which was not built to offer Sacrifice thereon, but to be a Witneſs of what was formerly done, *Joſh.* 22.28. ſo the poſitive Precept for Dipping ſhall only ſtand as a Monument of what was done in the Primitive Time.

5. It's but a begging the Queſtion in this caſe, to ſay that the poſitive Precept doth interfere with the moral. No inſtance can be given of any one Perſon diſcipled to Chriſt, that ever ſuſtain'd the leaſt damage, or had his Health impaired by being Dipt, no not in the coldeſt ſeaſon under this cold Climate.

2*dly*. Conſider, if you miſtake the Form, you miſtake the Eſſence, for the Eſſence of a thing lies as well in the Form as in the Matter.

3*dly*. If you miſtake the Form you deceive the Subject, he

he thinks he is baptized when it's no such matter, he is but rantized, not baptized.

4*thly*, If you mistake the Form, the Subject loses the benefit of the Ordinance; for it's not Rantism, but Baptism that obligeth the Subject to die to Sin, and to live to Holiness, *Rom.* 6. 4. It's Baptism, not Rantism that doth evidence together with Faith our Title to Salvation, *Mark* 16. 16.

Secondly, I would caution People, and that in two Branches.

1*st*. To beware you do not take up this Ordinance of Baptism till such time as you are discipled unto Christ.

1. Consider, there are many that will desire to be baptized, and are so, that are not discipled in deed but only in shew; *Simon Magus* was baptized, and I suppose there is no doubt but *Judas*, and *Ananias*, and *Sapphira*, and many more were baptized, that were never really discipled to Christ.

2. Consider, you have no right to the Ordinance till you believe; *Acts* 8. 37. *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst:* the contrary that offers it self is this, If thou dost not believe with all thy heart, thou mayst not.

3. The Ordinance will stand you in no stead if you do not believe, it will be no ways acceptable unto God, nor profitable to your selves; *Without Faith it's impossible to please God*; and without Faith it will be no Evidence of your Title to Salvation: it's *not the putting away the filth of the Flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience by the Resurrection of Christ*, that will stand us in stead.

4. You will make your selves Hypocrites thereby, rank your selves among the number of foolish Virgins, and so render your Condition worse than it was.

2*dly*. I would caution such as are discipled to Christ, to beware they do not rest satisfied without taking up the Ordinance: And here consider a few things.

1. There are many that do give good tokens of their Love to Christ, to his Ways, and to his Saints, that yet remain unbaptized.

2. Consider you do not only lie short of your Duty here while you do lie short of the Duty of Baptism, but you lie short

ſhort of many other Duties as well as of this; ſhort of the Duty of Church-Communion, ſhort of the Supper of the Lord.

3. You do not only lie ſhort of Duty, but you debar your ſelves of your Privileges alſo; you complain of the want of Aſſurance, and neglect the means of Aſſurance; Baptiſm and the Supper of the Lord are ſtrengthening and confirming Ordinances.

4. The neglect of Duty when it may be performed is Sin, as well as the commiſſion of Evil; ſo that you live in Sin all the while you live in the neglect of Duty.

3dly. I would make uſe of it by way of Examination; try then whether you be diſciples unto Chriſt.

1. Have you that Gift by which you underſtand the Myſteries of the Kingdom of Heaven? I call it a Gift becauſe the Scripture calls it ſo, *Mat.* 13. 11. *To you it's given to know the Myſtery of the Kingdom of Heaven, but to them it is not given.* No natural Abilities can reach this; no acquired Parts can furniſh us with the knowledg thereof, it's the Gift of Chriſt; *John* 17. 2, 3. *That I may give eternal Life to as many as thou haſt given me: And this is Life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* The great Myſtery of Godlineſs, is God in Chriſt, God manifeſted in the Fleſh, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. Do you know Jeſus Chriſt? do you know him in his Natures, God-man, two Natures united in one; Man, that he might do and ſuffer the Will of God; and God, that he might merit by doing and ſuffering? Do you know him in his Offices, Prophet, Prieſt and King? He that hath truly learned Jeſus Chriſt, is diſciples unto Chriſt. I ſhall now lay you down a few Marks of a Perſon that hath truly learned, or is diſciples unto Chriſt.

(1.) It's a ſign that a Perſon is diſciples unto Chriſt, or that he hath truly learned Jeſus Chriſt, if the Will doth follow the Underſtanding, cloſing with Jeſus Chriſt; where the Soul makes a Reſignation of himſelf to Chriſt, to be taught by him, and ſaved by him, and ruled and governed by him, and him alone; where he goes out of his own Righteouſneſs, and applys the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt alone

in

in point of Justification; *Phil.* 3. 9. when the Soul is willing to *be found in him, not having his own Righteousness, which is of the Law, but the Righteousness of God, which is by Faith:* I say, this is a sign of a Disciple of Christ. Psal. 9. 10. *They that know thy Name, will put their Trust in thee.* John 6. 45. *Every one that hath heard, and learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* It's a sign that the Understanding is truly inlightened where the Will follows the Understanding.

(2.) It's a sign that a Soul hath truly learned Jesus Christ, and is indeed discipled unto Christ, if he hath so learned Christ as to deny himself for Christ: Luke 14. 26. *Except a Man hate Father and Mother, yea and his own Life, he cannot be my Disciple.* There is a threefold Self-denial.

1. A denial of sinful self, this must be in all cases, in all places, at all times. *He that nameth the Name of Christ, let him depart from all Iniquity*; 2 Tim. 2. 19.

2. A denial of religious self; but this is only in the point of Justification; *Phil.* 3. 9. *I would not be found in my own Righteousness, which is of the Law, but in the Righteousness of God, which is by Faith.* We must go out of every thing of our own, Duty and Qualifications, lay all at the feet of Christ, and rest solely on his Righteousness.

3. There is a denial of natural self; self-Riches, Honour, Pleasure, Liberty, Life and all; but this must be only when any, or all of these come in competition with Christ, then we must take up our Cross and follow him, *Luke* 14. 27.

(3.) It's a sign of a Disciple of Christ, where there is true Love to those that are discipled unto Christ: *John* 13. 35. *By this shall all men know that you are my Disciples, if you have love one to another:* Love to Saints, as Saints, purely upon the account of the Image of God that appears in them, is a Mark by which a Man may be known to himself, and others too, to be a Disciple of Christ.

Fourthly. I would make use of it by way of Exhortation to such as are discipled to Christ, and not yet baptized, that you would now take up the Ordinance: And here I shall lay down a few Motives to inforce the Exhortation.

1. Con-

1. Consider it's your Duty; as soon as a Person is discipled unto Christ, he is bound to be baptized: my Text injoins the Subject as well as the Administrator, *Go disciple to me*, i. e. *baptizing them*, &c. Acts 2. 38. *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ.*

2. Consider you are meet Subjects for Baptism; you believe, therefore you may: you are put into the Commission as having a right to the Ordinance; you are capable to worship God in Spirit and in Truth; and they are such Worshippers that the Lord himself seeks for, *John* 4. 23.

3. Consider it was not the Practice of the Primitive Christians to delay in this matter; however it's now become too much a Practice: Three thousand converted and baptized the same day, *Acts* 2. 41. The Jaylor and his Houshold converted and baptized the same hour of the night, *Acts* 16. 33.

4. Consider, a little delay in this matter hath met with a Reprehension; *Why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized:* Acts 22. 16.

5. Consider, it's your Privilege as well as your Duty; this is one step towards Church-Communion; this prepares you to join Communion regularly: Acts 2. 41. *Then they that gladly received the Word, were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand Souls.* First, discipled; secondly, baptized; and thirdly, added to the Church. Here is the Apostolical Order; and being added, they are admitted to all the Ordinances: *They continued in the Apostles Doctrine, and Fellowship, and breaking of Bread, and Prayer.*

Object. But some may say, they have not that assurance of their being discipled unto Christ as they desire to have.

To this I answer: Should we stay from taking up the Ordinance till we have that assurance as we desire to have, we may stay till it be too late; I know none that hath that assurance as they desire to have; their assurance is imperfect.

2. The way to attain assurance is to take up the Ordinance: *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved:* Mark 16. 16.

3. It's not the Faith of Assurance, but the Faith of Recombance, or Reliance, that gives a right to the Ordinance: *Acts* 8. 37. *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst:* and this a Person may do that yet is in the dark, whether he do believe or no, *Isa.* 50. 10.

4. If you can take up the Ordinance purely in obedience to the Command of God, submitting your selves to the Mediatory Authority of the Lord Jesus, you may go on with Comfort, it's a true sign that your Natures are changed: *For the carnal Mind is Enmity against God, and is not subject unto the Law of God, neither indeed can be*; Rom. 8. 7. And if your Natures are changed, there is a Light infused, by which you are instantly discipled unto Christ: 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. *God who commanded Light to shine out of Darkness, hath shined in our Hearts, to give the light of the knowledg of the Glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ.*

For Dr. William Russel, *dwelling in* Barbican, *London.*

SIR,

I Have read your Narrative of the *Portsmouth* Disputation with some Ministers of the Presbyterians; and have also seen another Book published by your Adversaries, intituled, *An Impartial Account of the* Portsmouth *Disputation*, ——by *Samuel Chandler, William Leigh, Benjamin Robinson.* Wherein I find such unchristian Reflections and Wrong done you, as sutes not with the Profession they make of true Religion, but greatly demonstrates the badness of their Cause. And I wonder at their Impudence in putting so plain a Cheat upon the World, as I find in *pag.* 79. in these words, *viz.* Whether he might not have spared all his *Dutch?* seeing *Doop* in that Language signifies only to wash, and is used when they only pour on Water. That this account of the word *Doop* is notoriously false appears from the common use of the word, and the account which is given of it in their Dictiona-

Dictionaries. One I have by me, which I believe is the largeſt and beſt in that Tongue, it being a double Dictionary of *Dutch* and *Engliſh*, and *Engliſh* and *Dutch*, with Grammars to each of them: by *Hendrick Hexham* and *Daniel Manly*, and printed at *Rotterdam* 1675, and 1678. wherein the *Engliſh* word Dip is render'd *Doop*: as, to dip in a Sauce, *Doopen in een ſanſſe*; to dip to the bottom, *Doopen tot den grondt toe*: Dipped *Gedoopt*; a dipping, *een doopinge*; and *Doop*, *Doopſel* Baptiſm; *Doopen* to baptize, *Dooper* Baptizer, *Doop dagh* the day of Baptiſm; *Doopen onder her water*, to duck or dive under Water. I alſo find, that to waſh or rince is in *Dutch Waſſchen ofte Spoelen*; to ſprinkle, *Stroyen ſpreyden ſprenckelen*; and alſo *Beſprengen* is to ſprinkle, beſprinkle or to ſtrow: to pour is in *Dutch Gieten* or *ſtorten*; poured upon, *Opgegoten ofte op Geſtort*. Now ſeeing there is nothing of truth in what they ſay in contradiction to you of the word *Doop*, but that it undeniably appears from the *Dutch* Dictionary to ſignify to dip, to duck or dive, and that it has nothing in its ſignification either to ſprinkle or waſh by pouring Water, which things are render'd by other *Dutch* words: I know not how they can clear themſelves from the guilt of a wilful Lie to cheat the People of the true form of Goſpel-Baptiſm, which, in my opinion, is a greater Sin than to cheat them of their Mony. And it's greatly to be lamented that any profeſſing Godlineſs, ſhould ſo groſly ſtain their Religion for the ſake of Infant-ſprinkling, a meer human Tradition, which has neither Command nor Example for it in the holy Scriptures.

Sir, I was willing to communicate this unto you, that if you need the Evidence of this Dictionary, and have not already met with it, you may have recourſe unto it. And ſo heartily wiſhing you the increaſe of true Wiſdom and Chriſtian Courage for the defence of the Truth of Chriſt which you are engaged in, I reſt your loving Chriſtian Friend and Brother,

Leominſter, Nov. 17. 1699. *Iſaac Marlow.*

I have examined this Letter, and find it to agree exactly with *Hexam's Dutch* Dictionary; and theſe Presbyters have

most basely betray'd their Ignorance in that Language, and have made their Reflections to consist of the most shameful Forgeries and Falshoods they could well have invented, both in this and the rest of their Accusations against me and others, as appears by those many authentick and undeniable Testimonies given under the Hands of so many Eye and Ear-Witnesses, who have also (some of them) prov'd Mr. *Chandler* to be a most notorious Liar to his very face, before divers of his Hearers, and others then present. And had not the Book swell'd too big, there had been printed a large Letter from Mr. *Williams*'s Son, directed to those three Presbyters, wherein he hath not only justified his Father, but my self also, from those vile Reflections they have unjustly cast both upon the Living and the Dead: But if they offer to persevere in their lying Vanities, and gross Abuses, they may be furnished with that, and much more, not only from both his Sons, but from an eminent Person living in *Portsmouth*, who hath written largely upon that Subject, and also in Vindication of me and my True Narrative; who will neither be afraid nor asham'd to own what they have written, having given it under their Hands: And therefore both Mr. *Sharp* and my self do beg their Pardon, that we have omitted to make it publick for the Reason above-mentioned.

There are many things which they have asserted that are utterly false, which I have not took notice of; but I cannot omit what they have asserted in *p.* 64. of their Partial Account, where they bring me in saying, But βαπτω is a Diminutive from βαπτίζω; and they pretend a Voucher for it, but we must not know who. This is like the story about *Isaac Harman*, and is printed to no other purpose than to render me ridiculous; as if I did not know that βαπτω is the Theme, and βαπτίζω a Derivative from it. But I must charge it upon them as a Forgery and Invention of their own, for I neither said so, neither was it possible for me to think so. But why should I think it strange for them to belie me, when Mr. *Leigh* hath been so bold to belie the Lord Jesus? For, after they have mentioned *Mark* 7. 4. in their Printed Account in the Page before recited, they bring in these words as spoken by me, That it's render'd *dipping* in our *English* Transla-

Translation, as, *He that dippeth with me in the dish.* And Mr. *Leigh* (as they say) replying, The word is there βαπτω, not βαπτίζω. Now whether he means *Mark* 7. 4. or that Passage about *Judas* in the Evangelists, it's notoriously false; for the word βαπτω is not to be found in any of those places: And he discovers his ignorance in the Greek Tongue, to talk after that unthinking and loose manner.

W. R.

POST-SCRIPT.

A Letter from Portsmouth *concerning Mr.* Chandler, *dated* Nov. 9. 1699. *occasioned by his Post-script about* Isaac Harman, *in their second Edition.*

Honoured Brother Russel;

THese are to desire you to cause these few Lines to be printed, that the World may be rightly inform'd of the horrid falseness of Mr. *Chandler*, and his malicious Insinuation, by which he would fain perswade the World to believe that Mr. *Bowes* and his Party (intending thereby the Church of Christ at *Portsmouth*, whereof he is Minister) were so envious against their Brethrens Prosperity, that they did suspend me from their Communion for going to hear Mr. *Webber*; and is so particular in it, that he mentions my Name (viz. *Isaac Harman*;) and that he might gain the greater Credit to this great Lie, that so it might pass for Truth, he hath back'd it with another notorious Lie, *viz.* That I told him so my self, and ask'd his Advice: And in three days after I had opposed them, and charged them with a horrid Lie, they did (with much ado) procure a most wicked and worthless Woman to avouch it for a Truth, and that it was spoken in her House when Mr. *Chandler* was there. But this Assertion of Mr. *Chandler* and his wicked

Avoucher

Avoucher I am bound in Conſcience to bear my Teſtimony againſt even to my dying day.

And I do now in the preſence of Almighty God, and before all the World moſt ſolemnly proteſt,

1. That I never was ſuſpended by Mr. *Bowes* nor his Party (as he calls them) for going to hear Mr. *Webber*, nor for any other Crime in all my life-time.

2. That I never had one word of Diſcourſe with Mr. *Chandler* in all my life-time, till I charged him with writing this notorious Lie concerning me. And to the Truth of this I do ſolemnly call God to record this day; and by the Truth of this I do deſire to ſtand or fall at the Judgment-day of Chriſt.

Witneſs my Hand, *Iſaac Harman.*

And upon the 16*th* of *October* 1699. I offered to atteſt upon Oath before the Right Worſhipful Mayor of *Portſmouth*, That what I have here aſſerted is the Truth, and nothing but the Truth, concerning Mr. *Chandler* and his wicked Avoucher Mrs. *Jones:* And it hath pleaſed God ſo to work things about, that what I have ſaid will appear to be the Truth, againſt all its black Enemies, and dark Oppoſers: For God hath confounded their Language, in that they have preſumed thus to belie the Truth, wrong their innocent Neighbours, and deceive the World; for they now appear like the Builders of *Babel*, all Confuſion; and may be rank'd with thoſe two wicked Elders that ſo falſly accuſed innocent *Suſanna*; which will evidently appear to all Men that this Prieſt hath not rid out of their Wits by his Prieſt-craft: for, when Mr. *Chandler* and Mrs. *Jones* were examined apart, they could agree in their Teſtimony no better than the two wicked Elders did in theirs.

For when Mrs. *Jones* was examin'd, ſhe offer'd to atteſt upon Oath, That on a certain idle day *in the morning*, I came to her Houſe to inquire for a young Man, and that I tarried there the ſpace of an hour, in which time Mr. *Chandler* and his Wife going by her Houſe, ſhe called them both into her Houſe; and that I then told Mr. *Chandler* what he hath printed: But being ask'd what that was, ſhe could not tell.

And

And when Mr. *Chandler* was examin'd, he declares the direct contrary: For he asserteth, That a certain *Evening* as he was walking *all alone*, he happen'd to go in at Mrs. *Jones*'s House, where there was a young Man that told him that he was suspended, and ask'd his Advice.

And now I leave the World to judg of Mr. *Chandler* and his wicked Avoucher: for she says it was in the *Morning*, but he saith it was in the *Evening*; he also saith he was *all alone*, but she saith his Wife was with him. But at length Mrs. *Jones* hath confest Mr. *Chandler* was not there when the words were spoken: This she declar'd to one *Thomas Whitewood*, which he will make Oath of if call'd thereunto.

Notwithstanding they were thus detected, he hath had the Confidence to publish a Postscript to their second false Account of the Disputation, which is stuff'd full of horrid Forgeries; wherein he asserteth, that I have confest to several, and some of our own Friends (Members of our Communion) have acknowledg'd, how that I was check'd at our Monthly Meeting for hearing of Mr. *Webber*: And that when I went to sit down at the Sacrament, some rose up and said, If I sat down they would not; on which I withdrew as virtually suspended.

I do now utterly deny all that he hath there written; and I do hereby challenge Mr. *Chandler* to produce any Members of our Communion, that either have said, or will say what he hath written in his lying Pamphlet, and I will give him the Cause.

But let not Mr. *Chandler* think that the presumptious Conclusion of his blundering Postscript is a sufficient Testimony to prove his invented Lies, by saying as *Pilate* did, *What I have written, I have written.* For, notwithstanding he would fain put it off with his surly Answer, It shall not serve his turn, I do here once more charge them upon him as invented Lies; and therefore let him clear himself, or confess his Sin, or for ever bear that Shame, which is the just desert of all such (as he is) that love and make Lies.

He is pleased to pray that God would give me Repentance: To which I shall answer in the Language of my Saviour to those of old, *Weep not for me, but weep for your selves*: so say

I to Mr. *Chandler*, Let him pray for himself, and not for me; for the Prayers of the wicked are Abomination in the sight of the Lord.

But alas! what will not this Man say, whose Piety consisteth more in Eating and excessive Drinking, than in Prayer and Fasting; and his Works more in envious Lying and Slandering, than in Truth and Charity: For tho none preaches Charity more than he, there are none uses less than himself; nor none that have more need of it than he, because he lives by Charity, and cannot live without it. He is also one of the greatest pretenders to Learning that ever I knew, altho none are more unlearned than he; for he hath not yet learned to speak the Truth of his Neighbours; yet he hath too much Learning for his Brain, and too little Judgment for his Learning; and his too great opinion of both spoils all.

He is so frequent in the speculation of his own Parts and Abilities, that he is not at leisure to take a view of his own Deformities: His Eyes, like a Drunkard, see all things double; and his Fancy, like an old Man's Spectacles, makes a great Letter in a small Print. And as he never fixes his Eyes on himself without Admiration, so he never removes them to his Neighbours without Reflection, calling them Blockheads, *&c.* His Discourse is all Positions; thus it is, and thus it must be; and as I have written, I have written. But he will not so much degrade his own Authority, as to submit what he saith to Proof and Trial, but you must take his bare word for it; and tho the matter be never so false, he is presently in a rage with all that will not believe his Lies to be true, without calling him into question about them. I fear he is one that hath lost all good in himself, and is unwilling to find it in his Neighbours: For he and his wicked Avoucher hath bely'd the Truth, and enviously slander'd the Innocent: He is an everlasting Argument, but I am weary of him, whose Religion is a question, and his Salvation a greater, which Death only will conclude, and Judgment resolve; and then all his Lying and Quibbles, and his unreasonable Cavils must have an end. And therefore I bid him farewel, till I catch him again (as I have already done) in his belying of me.

Isaac Harman.